THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. IX JULY, 1924 No. 49

EDITORIAL

FURTHER PLEA FOR A SINGLE REVISED LITURGY

The House of Clergy of the Church Assembly will be engaged this month again upon the work of Prayer-Book Revision, and will presumably carry it yet another stage further; and it may not be amiss to press once more the great importance of agreement upon a single revised Office. Our own standpoint in the matter has been already declared: it is that which the Dean of Wells so powerfully put before our readers last February, and which the Dean of Salisbury supported with additional reasons last week. Meanwhile, the general considerations in favour of a single Canon become steadily more weighty. The advocates of revision have been under an inevitable handicap in the discussion of the subject, owing to the fact that their proposals were still in the making; but the great bulk of church-people have been content to believe that the finished result would be such as to make for peace, order, and edification. We do not hesitate to say that this body of opinion would be gravely disappointed, if the outcome should prove to be not one revised Service, but two. They would feel that their patience had been misplaced; that the hope with which they had tempered their innate conservatism had been frustrated; and that they had no adequate reply to make to the purely reactionary elements which have lately become so active. Over and over again in history sound reform has been delayed, if not frustrated, through divergence in the ranks of the progressive forces. The Church has no exemption from this law. We do not doubt that our leaders are well aware of the danger. But we hope that the House of Clergy will not wait for them to dispel it, but will firmly take the wise course themselves.

No fear need be felt that the work already done on the two Canons will be in any way wasted in such a case; for the discussion has served to bring out in clear relief, and without heat

or passion, the points about which the supporters of each really care. The task now is to reconcile these, not by compromise but by a real synthesis. And we do not believe the task to be insuperable. Let anyone take the two Canons (which were published in THEOLOGY for last December) and consider the points of variation.

1. We may take first one or two easier matters. The Grey Book supporters desire to emphasize the truth that the Eucharist is a memorial not of our Lord's Death only, but of Himself; and with this in view propose an allusion to the Incarnation in the opening sentence of the prayer. Not only is this clause simple, short, and well-balanced, but its substance is entirely in keeping with primitive models. Primitive liturgies indeed allow themselves a large room in the commemoration of our Lord's incarnate Ministry before coming to the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist.

2. In the words of the institution themselves the Grey Book would write "covenant" instead of "testament." Change at this point may seem regrettable to many; but in our own view this change is so full of teaching and makes so much for reality that we should welcome it.

---

3. A more serious difficulty occurs in the second paragraph of the Canon. The sentence (Hear us, O Father, etc.), as it stands in our present book, is felt to be inadequate, as it beseeches no blessing upon the act of consecration in which the Church is engaged. At the same time, the form of it proposed in the A. Canon* is open to a similar objection, because it supplicates no blessing upon the act of communion. The B. Canon† cuts the knot by omitting the entire sentence, in any form, at this point. Would not the true solution be to amplify the sentence in the A. Canon by adding a clause containing a definite reference to communion and its meaning? The Church would then, thus early, ask for God's blessing upon the whole action here ensuing and upon each of its great "moments" or points of stress; praying that, as we do what Christ did, He may hallow the deed.

---

4. In our June issue the Dean of Salisbury added some weighty doctrinal reasons to those which the Dean of Wells urged last February against the introduction of an express Invocation of the Holy Spirit at the end of the Consecration Prayer. He points out that the thought of the sub-Apostolic Age, following New Testament lines, concentrated in devotion on the co-inherence of the Divine Persons in the Blessed Trinity

* *I.e.*, the modified Green Book form. See THEOLOGY, December, 1923.
† *I.e.*, the modified Grey Book form.

rather than on the distinction in their functions; and he pleads for the maintenance of this tendency of thought, so characteristic of the West, in our revised liturgy. We need not say that we wholly agree with the Dean. But we were delighted also to note that he feels, as we do, the need of some form " of the ancient prayer, *Supplices te rogamus*, which in the Western rite takes the place of the petition for the descent of the Spirit upon the oblation:

"' . . . and command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of Thy holy angel to be brought up into Thy holy tabernacle, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty.' "

Whether the original allusion be here (as Professor G. A. Cooke suggested last April) to Michael, or (as many scholars think) to our Lord's High Priesthood, or (as the Dean of Salisbury believes, and as we have it in the 1549 book) to the angels generally, we have wide testimony in it to a deep-rooted instinct in the mind of the Church—viz., the desire to pray that our manifold oblation may be consummated, where alone it can be, by acceptance " in the heavenly places."

The above paragraphs were already in proof before we had received the valuable letter from Dr. Brightman which we publish below. It is peculiarly welcome as representing a refusal to regard as ultimate the commonly accepted differences between Eastern and Western ideas of consecration. Further, though Dr. Brightman joins issue with the Dean of Wells on many points of scholarship, he writes as one who would " deplore the adoption for any purpose of the ' Grey Book ' Canon in its present ungainly and incoherent shape," and holds no brief for an Invocation in the place there suggested.

We venture to draw particular attention to the following points in Dr. Brightman's letter:

(*a*) *Epiclesis* has a double sense—viz., a calling of the Holy Spirit *to* our aid, and a calling of Him *upon* or *over* things or persons.

(*b*) The idea of Eucharistic consecration as effected by the operation of the Holy Ghost is at least as early as the *Didaskalia Apostolorum*—say, A.D. 275.

(*c*) The idea of our Lord's presence in the Eucharist as Priest and Consecrator is not merely Western—*e.g.*, it is familiar to St. Chrysostom.

(*d*) The idea that all that God does He does through the operation of the Holy Ghost is common both to East and to West.

(*e*) The Western view is regularly accompanied by the recognition " that the Words of Institution, considered as the form of consecration, are effective through the operation of the

Holy Ghost." [N.B.—The passage cited on p. 38 from Paschasius Radbert shows how the *Supplices Te* clause can be both referred to our Lord's High Priesthood and connected with the operation of the Holy Ghost.]

(*f*) Dr. Brightman summarizes the common mind of East and West on the subject as follows: "Christ our Lord as the true Priest and Consecrator in each celebration of the Liturgy, repeating His Words of Institution by the mouth of His human minister, and the Eternal Spirit operating the consecration, as also He operated the Incarnation."

(*g*) The adoption of an "indefinite" invocation, as in 1549 and in the Green Book, "might just produce the balance required for a 'mediating position.'"

(*h*) Dr. Brightman advocates "proper prefaces for Advent, Lent, Passiontide, and one for all unoccupied Sundays," and the insertion of words in the narrative of the Institution which will make it plain that the recital is addressed to God the Father.

We need not press for the most careful consideration of Dr. Brightman's views, for we feel sure that they will receive it, if only by reason of the unique authority with which he speaks. But this letter is peculiarly opportune in relation to the stage now reached in the Assembly. It shows us how the points represented in the two canons provisionally approved can perfectly well be represented in one, so far as the question of an Invocation is concerned. And though many of us feel no desire for an Invocation of the 1549 type, and in that place, we do not doubt that it would be accepted in the Church as a whole if it were found necessary for effecting a reconciliation between the two canons.

---

5. We come to the last point of difficulty—the place of the oblation of "ourselves, our souls and bodies." And here we must frankly say that synthesis seems to us impossible. If the Grey Book proposal to keep this element of the oblation in its present place after the Communion be allowed to stand, we shall have, not one revised Service, but two; and it is, therefore, from the practical and pastoral point of view the crux of the matter. We have had so much cause to be grateful to the supporters of the Grey Book for their steadfast adhesion to the principles of revision and progress that we hesitate to cavil at a point to which they attach so much importance. Moreover, as Professor Burkitt has shown, Cranmer, in making this dislocation, was emphasizing a real element in the conception of the eucharistic sacrifice. We have ourselves in these

columns admitted its attractiveness. But we have come to feel that, apart from the urgent practical considerations already mentioned, there are decisive reasons of principle for returning (as N.A. 84 and the Green Book do) to the primitive custom of including this clause in the Canon itself.

The idea of the oblation of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" is, of course, fundamental to the New Testament conception of the Christian life. The Grey Book seeks to emphasize this by setting it in a prayer which the congregation can join in repeating. They further urge that this is its proper place, because it is only in so far as we have received God's grace through the eucharistic meal, and are thus in communion with our Lord, that we can make this offering. That is a piece of devotional teaching to which none would wish to take exception. But in a matter of this kind we have to be very careful lest piety impose glosses on the Word of God which result in disturbing its balance of truth. And this is the real danger here. For the fact is that throughout *the New Testament, without exception, not the Eucharist but Baptism is given as the ground of the Christian's self-dedication to God.**

Now we submit that in a case where the voice of Scripture is so plain, so coherent, and so undeviating as it is in this matter, it is a very grave thing for the Church to seek to improve upon it in its liturgical forms. The privilege and duty of self-dedication to God belong to every Christian in virtue of his Baptism. Moreover, this particular element in the Christian sacrifice is the one which, beyond all others, Holy Scripture singles out as involved in the status of the baptized. And we do not think that this is a time at which to shift the emphasis of New Testament teaching. We cannot believe that there is less need now than in Apostolic days to lay stress on the full moral implications of the first of the sacraments. There is room in unofficial books of devotion for many developments of scriptural doctrine such as the experience of the Church and the guidance of the Holy Spirit may suggest. But there is not room for such developments, we submit, in the central liturgical prayer of the Church's public worship. There, above all, we should keep to the middle of the road. And in this case the middle of the road is clearly indicated by the lead of Scripture. It is that all that we offer in the Eucharist we offer as baptized Christians. And its corollary is that the true place for this, the moral, element in our oblation is with the other elements —before the act of communion.

* The crucial passages are Rom. vi. 1-12, 1 Cor. vi. 11-20, and Eph. v. 26-30. *Cf.* also Rom. xii. 1 *ff.*, Heb. x. 19-22, 1 Cor. xii. 13-27, Col. ii. 12, Eph. iv. 4, 5.

ARE THERE ANY MESSIANIC PREDICTIONS?*

I

It is well known that the monuments which during the last century have arisen from their long sleep in the lands of the Tigris and Euphrates are described in many quarters as the oldest presentments of many Old Testament ideas. Such sentences as the following have indeed been printed: "The little village [Israel] has Babylon's art, Babylon's civilization, and only through Babylon is it what it is."† That this assertion of many scholars is, generally speaking, unfounded has often been shown.‡ But what of the particular theory that Messianic predictions are heard in the writings brought to light by the excavations in Assyria, Babylonia and elsewhere? The facts are as follows.

Among the cuneiform documents, especially those which were found in the royal library of Assurbanipal (668-626) and have been preserved in all essentials in the British Museum, appear, as all admit, whole series of prophetic books, for in the clay tablets the sequence of the tablets has already been noted by the so-called Guardians.§ But, to begin with, a large part of the sections of Assyrian and Babylonian literature, which purport to throw light on the future, consist to a surprising extent of *mere inquiries*. For example, one wants to know whether Bartatua will remain a loyal friend of Assyria if he marries a daughter of the King of Assyria. And, even if answers are read in the texts, almost always they have to do with politics or other external matters. Even the following surprising announcement refers only to State affairs: "The coast-land [*i.e.*, the northern shore of the Persian Gulf] will not spare the coast-land, nor the Assyrian the Assyrian, nor one land another, nor one house another, nor one man another, but they will kill one another, and then will the Accadian [in Northern Babylonia] rebel, to cast them one and all to the ground." This prophecy probably refers to the great political struggles between the many different tribes of the Euphrates region which preceded the setting up of the Babylonian United Kingdom (*c.* 1950 B.C.). This text has been described by an English investigator as "a parallel to the belief in a Messiah."‖

* Professor König's article has been kindly translated for THEOLOGY by Mr. Lowther Clarke.

† Otto Weber, *Theologie und Assyriologie im Streit um Babel und Bibel* (1904), pp. 5, 10 *f.*

‡ *Cf.* the materials for comparison collected in my little work, *Die moderne Babylonisierung der Bibel* (1922).

§ Carl Bezold, *Ninive und Babylon* (1909), p. 122.

‖ T. K. Cheyne in *Encl. Bibl.*, col. 3063.

Although he begins by interpreting the words "the coast-land shall overthrow the coastland" of Hammurabi's victory over his adversaries, he goes on to say: "This king is to open a golden age of peace." But nothing is found in the text that could be so interpreted. There are only these partly disconnected words which occur towards the end of the text: "The gods of the country, which were angry, wilt thou propitiate. Unnumbered years . . . because, though Urra was wroth, his counsellor appeased him." In the expression "unnumbered years" we have merely an exaggerated expression for the long duration which is naturally desired for the government of every victorious ruler.

We must then conclude that Babylonian-Assyrian literature contains no announcements of the future such as may be called "Messianic predictions." For nowhere is the future appearance of a mediator of salvation or the future coming of a Messiah foretold.*

There are, indeed, one or two scholars who speak of an "ancient Oriental expectation of a Deliverer." As, for example, in the following passage: "The Oriental expectation of a redeemer, both in Babylonia and Egypt, takes the form of the teaching of the incarnation of the calendar-god, who in the succession of the seasons conquers the dark power and brings the spring of the world. The bringer of the new time is to be in the first place Marduk, the city-god of Babylon."† But this "teaching of the incarnation of the calendar-god" is by no means seen clearly in the cuneiform texts, as the thorough investigations of several scholars have proved.‡ As a second "bringer of the new time" A. Jeremias§ mentions "Tammuz, the partner of the mother-god and queen of heaven, their child and lover, brother and husband. He manifests the phenomena of death and revival in the seasons, as they are displayed in the changes of the constellations and of vegetation." But this myth of Tammuz, which forms a parallel to the Adonis of the Phœnicians and personifies the life force of vegetation stirring in spring, only illustrates a natural process; it has to do only with outward or physical salvation, and, the main point here, his coming to life again *is repeated every year*. His new invigoration does not usher in a continuing period of salvation. On the contrary, every July—a month which in the Babylonian calendar takes its name from Tammuz—the splendour of

* Eichrodt, *Die Hoffnung des ewigen Friedens* (1920), p. 142, recognizes that "nowhere in the cuneiform literature is found any anticipation of a conclusive event."

† A. Jeremias, *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur* (1913), p. 205.

‡ *E.g.*, Aloys Kirchner, *Marduk von Babylon und Jesus Christus* (1922), p. 36 *f.*

§ *Op. cit.*, p. 206.

Nature, which had been presumably called forth by the spring-god, died away again under the scorching rays of the summer sun, whereupon they celebrated the burial of this "god," as the well-known Syrian author Lucian has vividly described.*

In the last twenty years there has been a great deal of talk among students of Comparative Religion about Egyptian predictions, and it is undoubtedly a noteworthy fact that in Gressmann's *Altorientlische Texte* there is no section dealing with Babylonian predictions,† but one finds a chapter on Egyptian descriptions of the future. But of what are these descriptions composed ?

The most important, the "prophecy of a lamb under King Bocchoris" (*c.* 770 B.C.), runs thus: "The calamity is great in Egypt. Weep, O Heliopolis in (?) the East ! Weep, O Thebes ! The lamb ended the curses. It said to him (?): [at the] end of nine hundred years, I will smite Egypt. . . . Lying, infringement of justice and law, as it has existed in Egypt. . . . They will take the chapels of the gods of Egypt for themselves to Nineveh. But the men of Egypt go into the land of Syria, they smite its districts, they find again the (stolen) chapels"; and through this victory Egypt will be filled with joy. This line of thought is expressed in very halting style. First Egypt is threatened with calamity because lying and infringement of law have come to rule in it. After the time of misfortune, however, days of victory and the joy that springs from it will come again. The other predictions which have been found in Egyptian literature follow very much the same line of thought. With some justice therefore people have lately applied the word "scheme" or "pattern" to these Egyptian announcements of the future.

But they have no more claim to the title of "Messianic predictions" than the Assyrian and Babylonian anticipations. For the Egyptian announcements of the future do *not*, any more than the others, promise a personality who will appear, as an agent of salvation and bringer of light, on the horizon of an impending period of consummation.

And can we arrive at any different conclusion when, with the question of Messianic predictions in mind, we survey Græco-Roman antiquity ? We meet indeed in Plato the ideal picture of a "righteous man," who is to appear as suffering undeservedly during his lifetime (because apparently punished by the gods), while in reality he is righteous. In the first place, however, this righteous man is meant merely as a type, since *all* such persons are thought of; and, secondly, his characteristics are ambiguous, for the description of them allows us to

* *De dea Syria*, 6-8.

† Nor is there in Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the O.T.* (1922).

assume that the righteous man described might be moved to regret his striving after righteousness. Further, in the famous fourth Eclogue of Vergil, we find the same feature in the description of the future conditions: "The wool will no more need to be dyed, because the ram itself in the meadow will clothe himself in purple colour"; and the lord of the future time is mourned for, because "neither has a god deemed him worthy of the table nor a goddess of the couch." Finally Ovid deifies the Emperor Augustus at the close of his well-known work —the *Metamorphoses*—when he says: "May that day be long in coming in which the exalted chief (*caput Augustum*) leaves the world he rules and ascends to heaven, and then though absent extends favours to those who pray" (that is, hears prayers). In all these utterances about the future—and this is the important thing—we have no more than the thought that every individual ruler mentioned will or may prove himself a "saviour" by victorious repulse of the enemy and by bringing about other happy conditions.

Nor does the Inscription of Priene (in Asia Minor), so often mentioned of late by philologians,* afford any proof that the expectation of a *unique* "saviour-king" was an idea familiar to the ancient world, as has often been supposed of late. This is all that is said in this decree of honour for Augustus: "The Providence which rules over our life has brought the highest perfection to this life by sending us Augustus, whom it filled with strength for the benefit of mankind; and it sent him to us and our posterity as a saviour who has made an end of war and settled all things." The mention of posterity only expresses the natural hope that the time of peace inaugurated by Augustus will last still longer. So in this decree of Priene too there is no thought expressed of the uniqueness of this ruler as the beginning of the time which brings the affairs of the world to completion.

II

The negative result attained in our search for "Messianic predictions" in the ancient Oriental and classical civilizations naturally leads us to the conclusion that the world of thought of the ancient East or Greece or Rome was not the parent the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament. No, the of biblical story of salvation, in which God's grace began after the first impiety of the human race (Gen. iii. 15) and after the Titans' revolt at Babel (xi. 1-9) took a new turning (xii. 1-3),† was the root of the blossoms which meet our gaze in the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament. They are

* *E.g.*, by Lietzmann, *Der Weltheiland* (1909), p. 19 *ff.*

† This is developed in my *Theologie des A.T.* (1923), pp. 47-50.

the announcements, grown on the soil of the religion of Revelation, of the future victory of the divine grace over human unrighteousness and of the agent of this victory.

This agent of salvation was designated at first after his office only in general terms as a conqueror. So in the Protevangelium (Gen. iii. 15) it simply says: " The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." The same general official character of the saviour appears in the words of Balaam: " There shall come forth a star out of Jacob " (Num. xxiv. 17). When, however, the kingdom had been accepted as one of the legitimate institutions of the Divine State, and had found an outstanding representative in the deeply religious David, the future deliverer appears as adorned with the kingly dignity. We hear this note first in Nathan's prophecy (2 Sam. vii. 11-16) and its echoes (Ps. ii. 7-9, etc.), and so he was often afterwards proclaimed as a ruler, as for example in Isaiah's jubilant words: " Unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder " (Isa. ix. 6); or in the cry: " Rejoice, O daughter (*i.e.*, citizens) of Zion; behold thy king cometh " (Zech. ix. 9). But with the royal office of the perfect successor of David were linked the offices of prophet (Deut. xviii. 15) and priest. This is manifest already in Ps. cx., for according to its fourth verse the double position of Melchisedek, king and priest of Jerusalem, was to be revived in the perfect Son of David. This linking up of the Messiah's royal and priestly office was later emphasized with ever-increasing strength; see for example Zech. vi. 13.

Parallel to this is the fact that as regards the saving work of the future deliverer the eye of the prophet became opened to an ever-fuller knowledge. For, at first, the victorious waging of political battles (Gen. xlix. 10, etc.) or impartial judging was recognized as such work. But later the suffering of the future deliverer comes into the foreground as his saving work. For already we see Immanuel sharing in the privations of the calamity which was to overwhelm Ahaz and the ungodly majority of contemporary Israel that adhered to him (Isa. vii. 15). Further, the predicted Son of David will not grow out of the top but from the stem of the tree which symbolizes the family of David (Isa. xi. 1). He will therefore share the sufferings which must be inflicted on the royal house, and this suffering of his will later be clearly recognized as that which is innocently borne on behalf of others for the propitiation of their guilt. For of God's servant, spoken of in Isa. liii., it is said: " Surely he bore *our* sicknesses."

What we could not find in the other literatures of the ancient East or of antiquity—namely, reference to a unique

personality who would in the future bring about once for all a change in the religious relation of man to God—appears, therefore, in the clearest manner in the old Hebrew literature. At first only gradually, as the wise plan of the divine education of the human race ordained, but finally with full clearness was this knowledge enkindled in the heralds of the Old Testament religion: that there is a divine plan which strives to make the true peace of mankind, and this plan of salvation because of the incredible obstinacy of the greatest part of mankind must advance to an ever higher offering of grace, as is revealed especially in Jeremiah's wonderful prophecy of the new covenant (xxxi. 31-34).

It seems, then, that the question which I made the title of this article, "Are there any Messianic predictions?" can only be answered in the affirmative, if we look at the ancient literature of Israel. But this is not the case. Even in the face of this literature the question has often of late been answered, and indeed can be answered, in the negative.

In the first place, there is a tendency in the modern interpretation of the O.T., according to which the O.T. announcements of salvation are said to be only the uncertain flickering reflection of what it is fashionable to call "popular eschatology."* Of such we know for certain from the sources only by a single example—namely, that those prophets whom the people called "*their* wise men" (Isa. xxix. 14) cried, "Peace, peace" (Jer. vi. 14, etc.)—that is, they were accustomed to paint the horizon of the future in rosy colours. But the friends of the new theory add to this the hope in a future transfiguration of nature (Isa. xi. 6-8), although this is found in an *opponent* of the popular prophets, and they talk accordingly much about the "Paradise-colouring" of the picture of the future, or of the dogma "*Urzeit=Endzeit*."† But what violence this modern assertion does to the sources, which alone can give information about the history of the course of prophetic thought! It is a historical injustice if a number of scholars now maintain that Isaiah and his like imitated those whose crying of "Peace, peace" was characterized by the O.T. prophets as a deceitful lulling to sleep of the people's soul. This recent attempt to deny that the O.T. predictions of salvation were expressions of a really higher knowledge on the part of true prophets cannot therefore explain away the existence of Messianic expectations.

In the second place some are ingenious enough to say:

* So H. Gressmann, *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1905), and his adherents down to Fullerton in *The Journal of Biblical Literature* (1922).

† The events of the beginning—*i.e.*, Genesis and the myths underlying it—are repeated in the last days.

"There are no Messianic predictions," meaning thereby that they ceased to exist by being fulfilled and realized.

We know, of course, that the Jews maintain that the O.T. predictions relating to the Messiah were not fulfilled. But in judging this very important matter the main point is that we distinguish between the particular and the general, between the outer formulating and the inner essence of the thing. Jesus not only knew how to weld into unity all the various traits of the O.T. picture of the consummation of the Kingdom of God—that alone would have been a great achievement—but He also recognized those lines of the picture on which the future stress lay. This can be shown by a single example.

From among the reminiscences of that great period when the living God, continuing the work begun in Abraham's call, had saved Abraham's heirs from distress and death and brought them "on eagle's wings" (Exod. xix. 4) to Abraham's new home, ring out the words: "Jahve shall reign for ever and ever" (xv. 18). Can we say that this fundamental principle was quite drowned by the profane cry of the majority for a king "like all the nations" (1 Sam. viii. 5)? Certainly not. This fundamental note of the all-surpassing authority of God in the common affairs of Israel sounds through the first tragic conflict between prophecy and royalty in Saul's time (1 Sam. xv.). Over against Solomon's senile disposition to develop the kingship in Israel on worldly lines, the old fundamental note of Jahveh's royal position sounds clearly in our ears when Ahijah rends the mantle into twelve pieces (1 Kings xi. 29 ff.). This fundamental note became ever louder in the course of the prophetic period. Prophetic declarations and political events, the revelation of the Ruler of the world in word and deed, combined to make the principle ever more clearly recognized, that the special kingdom of God to be founded in accordance with the divine plan for the education of humanity must be separated still further from the fashion of the states of the world and their ways. It was in Isaiah's time that the energetic impressing of this principle began (Isa. xxx. 15: "In quietness and confidence shall be *your* strength").

Can we not see clearly enough from this process of the guiding of Israel by the prophets where the end of the divine road lay as regards the character of the special Kingdom of God? According to the facts contained in the sources, it lay in the spiritualizing of its character. This Kingdom of God was clearly to be lifted in the end above the fashion of earthly states, as regards its sphere, its sources of strength, its blessings and tasks, right up into the sphere of the Spirit.

In view of this fact, no doubt can remain as to the lines in

the pictures of O.T. prediction on which the future stress was to be laid. Was it on the lines of the more earthly or the more heavenly colour-tones? on the political figures or on the religious and moral aspects of those pictures? As the process develops and the light is thrown ever more clearly on the prophetic picture of the future Kingdom of God, the observer becomes quite certain that the Messianic predictions found their souls, so to speak, in those constituent parts which point inwards and onwards.

Then were the majority of the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus justified in expecting a Messianic kingdom of an earthly type? No, a setting up of the political throne of the Son of David was not to be hoped for the time of the new covenant. The fundamental prophecy of this new covenant (Jer. xxxi. 31-34) says nothing about this. It sought rather to direct the eye of hope to quite different objects. According to it, the foundation of the salvation which was to be expected in the future, and consequently to be earnestly desired, was removal of the guilt of the old covenant-people. The majority of the Jews failed to see that the course of prophecy was intended to direct the eyes of the covenant people from material splendour to spiritual light and peace.

But did Jesus recognize the true purpose of the Messianic predictions? Certainly, and in the completest measure. For not only did He unite the brightest stars of the prophetic vision of the future into a comprehensive picture; He also carried forward the ascending lines of this picture to their highest possible culmination. For example, He completed the spiritualization of the Kingdom of God, the beginning of which can be proved in the O.T. (Jer. xviii. 30: "My kingdom is not of this world"). Thus Jesus fulfilled prophecy in an organic manner—that is, in a way that grew out of it inwardly. Perhaps we may call the relation of the achievement of Jesus to prophecy more rightly "congenial": the genius of prophecy has expressed itself perfectly in the work of Jesus.

Prophecy is like the dawn which heralds the day. But the dawn is not the actual orb of day. Aurora pales when the royal sun himself enters with his rays. So also the period of Messianic predictions passed away when with the coming of Christ a new æon in the history of God's realm of grace began.

Ed. König, D.D.,
Professor in the University of Bonn.

THE CHURCH AND INTELLECTUAL UNREST

NOTE.—The present article is not intended as a discussion of the extent, if any, to which the Church is bound to maintain for all time dogmas which have been pronounced by her final and infallible authority, nor yet of the method by which such pronouncements are to be recognized as final and infallible, particularly in a divided Church. On any showing there is a considerable difference of opinion as to what dogmas may claim final infallibility, and still more as to which out of several possible interpretations of such dogmas is the correct one. It is simply an attempt to indicate the right attitude of the Church, considered as an organized body for the preservation and propagation of the Christian faith towards movements which appear or profess to question the fundamental doctrines on which her system rests. The Catholic will, of course, necessarily hold that certain dogmas are incapable of change; but the mere fact of his confidence should enable him to view with equanimity the passing changes of human thought in the sure confidence that they will be forgotten while the truth will endure. Similarly, the Catholic will have his own view as to what the Church is; but with this, again, we are not at present concerned.

THE primary object of the Christian Church is to bring mankind to God through the person of our Lord. Whatever our belief may be as to the nature of Christ or the historical facts of His earthly life and teaching, it is clear that in some sense He must be accepted as the supreme revelation of God to man. Thus the Church is committed to a certain permanent element of truth, which it is not at liberty to modify in response to any intellectual demand. Thus, although opinions may differ, and do differ, widely as to the precise element of permanent truth which the Christian revelation involves, it is only a confusion of thought to suppose that there is not some permanent element in Christianity which is incapable of modification. Similarly, the general moral ideal of Christianity as embodied in the person of Jesus—which is by no means self-evident—would seem to be a permanent element which all are bound to admit that the Church cannot modify without ceasing to be Christian. The admission of these two points need not, of course, involve an admission that the moral ideal of Christianity is the same thing as its detailed application to particular circumstances; nor, again, is belief in our Lord as a revelation of God intended necessarily to mean belief in Him as a historical being.

Further, as an organized religious society, the Church is committed to the use of a system of worship as a means of accomplishing its object. In some way or another it must teach men to seek communion with God. Even if this communion be limited to personal meditation and mental prayer, the Church

must still teach that there is some means by which man can have access to God. In practice all organized Christian bodies have possessed a definite religious *cultus* for achieving this purpose. This element of *cultus* assumes a greater importance in proportion to the extent to which the body has a missionary character, and seeks to influence all varieties of mankind; but any Christian society must hold that there is some means of approaching God in worship and teach the necessity of doing so. We have thus another permanent element to which the Church must always be committed. Without the belief that there is a supreme type of moral holiness, in some way revealed in the person of our Lord, and some means of approaching Him and so approximating to Him as an ideal, the Christian Church would have no message at all and no reason for existing.

Thus the Church is committed in advance to certain presuppositions which are not really open to question; it is bound to resist currents of thought, the admission of which would be fatal to the presuppositions on which its existence depends, as, for instance, the denial of the existence of God, or His moral goodness, or the advocacy of an entirely non-Christian ideal of morality; or, again, the denial of the possibility of any form of access to God by prayer.

Thus all Christian thought is bound to assume that it has a real material to work on—namely, the apprehension of God as a reality external to man, who has revealed Himself in certain ways, and will continue to do so, if rightly sought. So far an open mind is impossible. It is one function of Christian theology to elucidate the exact implications of that revelation and man's apprehension of it, and to adjust it to the whole sum of human experience. For although the apprehension of God as revealed in Christianity is an ultimate fact of experience (if it be not a pure illusion), yet it is inconceivable that it can be contrary to reason. In other words, it must be capable of adjustment to the whole sum of human experience, at least to the extent of not being in direct contradiction to it. God may surpass our knowledge, but He cannot contradict it; if our knowledge of God contradicts our knowledge of the universe, we are bound to suppose that one or the other branch of knowledge needs revision.

But the function of theology is not merely the adjusting of our conceptions of God to the rest of human experience; it has also the task of elucidating exactly what our knowledge of God implies, and transforming the *data* of religious experience (including revelation) into a coherent body of knowledge. This function, again, is obviously necessary; if the Christian religion is to be preached to the world it must be a rational and

coherent system. (Thus the immediate effect of St. Paul's attempt to preach the Gospel to the world is the Pauline system of theology; it might almost be said that the Church before St. Paul had no theology at all.) However much we may hold that particular Christian systems have erred on the side of over-elaboration, it is impossible to deny the necessity of some system of dogmatic theology in a religion which appeals to the world at large. Such a system endeavours to explain the means by which man has access to God through the person of our Lord and to justify the use of that system of worship which it has in practice found best adapted for securing that access, which it is the function of Christianity to give.

Unfortunately, it is always possible for this function of Christian theology to work without relation to the other. There is thus a danger that a whole system of theology may arise in which every detail falls into a complete and coherent whole, but in which the whole itself is manifestly contrary to the demands of human reason. But the demands of human reason are in the first instance not obvious to any but a small number of thinkers and their immediate disciples. On the other hand, the religious society which has come to identify itself with an impossible theology is faced with the difficulty that the religious life of its members is intimately bound up with their acceptance of its whole system. At first sight it seems impossible to surrender the system without surrendering the religious life of the society. Further, the new truths which are alleged to be fatal to its system are often in the first instance put forward in the form of temerarious and ill-digested speculations, which do not, in fact, possess nearly the amount of rational authority which they claim. This process may be illustrated by the controversy of the last century as to the discoveries of Darwin. On the one hand, most Christian bodies had pledged themselves, more or less definitely, to the literal truth of every word of Scripture in its *prima facie* sense, and it seemed at first sight impossible to surrender this article of belief without surrendering the whole religious life of Christendom. On the other hand, while some elements of Darwin's discoveries and those of his contemporaries were in fact justified, others were not; and the inferences drawn as to their effect on Christian theology in some quarters were still less justifiable. Thus the demand that the Church should adapt its teaching to the demands of human thought is apt to present itself as a demand that the Church should abandon forms of teaching of proved and established worth in favour of speculations of doubtful value, which may at any moment be discredited by a further advance of knowledge. The Church as the guardian of a permanent

revelation cannot afford to do so; her function is to teach eternal truth, not to accept the latest speculations of the human mind. This aspect of her function is, of course, that which is pre-eminently present to those occupied in pastoral work, especially those who deal with the souls of the simple and ignorant, who are not in the least troubled by the progress of knowledge, but are seriously disquieted by any suggestion that the faith which they have learnt is anything but the final truth. It should be added that, in so far as any body of theology presents a coherent system (and any organized body which fails within certain limits to do so has failed in its duty of working out the implications of the revelation of God to man), it may easily seem difficult to surrender any item of that system without endangering the rest of the structure.

On the other hand, the purely conservative attitude just outlined is in itself indefensible, if, as may easily be the case, it persists in rejecting truths which are really established. It is bound to end in the discrediting of religion, at first among the learned, but ultimately among the ignorant, to whom the conflict between religion and knowledge will ultimately filter through in a crude and exaggerated form. (A very large amount of popular unbelief among the more ignorant classes at the present day is due to the belief that "the Bible has been shown [by Darwin and others] to be untrue"; the blame must largely be laid on those who sought to defend an impossible interpretation of the Scriptures in the second half of the nineteenth century.) Thus the "liberal" demand for an adjustment of the teaching of the Church to the advance of knowledge is in itself entirely justifiable; any failure to do so must ultimately result in intellectual suicide and the end of religion. Further, the liberal theologian often has a direct pastoral interest, since he sees that souls are being alienated from religion by its apparent identification with untenable traditions. He naturally and rightly urges the abandonment of beliefs which he sees to be untenable in themselves and fatal to religion.

None the less, his attitude may easily be as indefensible as that of the most rigid conservative. It is easy to admit that the Church is bound to modify her traditions where they are demonstrably inconsistent with the established results of the progress of human knowledge. But the phrase ignores the difficulties which normally exist in practice of ascertaining (1) exactly how far any fact of human knowledge can be regarded as finally fixed and established, and (2) how far such a fact is finally inconsistent with a particular tradition or doctrine of the Church. To take an obvious example, it is easy to say that the scientific criticism of the Scriptures has

overthrown old views as to the literal infallibility of the Scriptures. But it is impossible to produce an ecclesiastical definition of the authority of the Scriptures which can be shown to be rendered untenable by modern criticism; and still more impossible to find any general agreement among competent scholars as to the precise degree of authority to be attributed to the various portions of the Scripture, or even any very wide measure of agreement as to the established findings of criticism.

Thus in practice the liberal demand for a revision of ecclesiastical teaching to harmonize it with the results of the progress of human knowledge usually means in practice a demand for a revision to harmonize it with the private opinion of an individual scholar. Further, while the Christian scholar invariably believes that his particular body of teaching preserves the vital and essential elements of Christianity and only rejects certain unessential accretions, he forgets that it is not within the power of the individual to say what the essential truths of Christianity really are. The individual's apprehension of Christianity can never be more than partial; no two individuals apprehend Christianity in precisely the same way. The individual's belief that the essence of Christianity lies in certain particular elements of the Christian system often, in fact, simply amounts to the claim that his private apprehension of Christianity is the only finally valid one. It is often true that the rejection of certain elements of the Christian tradition would leave the faith of the individual untouched; but he has literally no means of telling whether such a rejection would not involve a shipwreck of the faith of others.

Thus the conservative attitude, if pressed to its logical conclusion, involves the isolation of faith from reason, and ultimately the destruction of the former; the liberal attitude involves the reduction of Christianity to that residuum, if any, which a consensus of liberal thought regards as the vital essence of Christianity. Stated in this form, both attitudes are manifestly absurd; the Church, if she is to fulfil her task of bringing mankind to God through Christ, must have some standard of teaching, consonant with human reason yet embodied in a coherent system of theology, to present to the world. It is entirely unreasonable to demand that this standard should be modified to suit every passing trend of speculation. On the other hand, it is entirely untenable to hold, as, in fact, many theologians do hold, that such a standard can be permanently upheld by the appeal to anything but reason. The authority of the Church's standard of teaching must necessarily depend in the last resort on the fact that it is true, not on the fact that it is the authoritative standard of the Church.

The solution of the difficulty seems to lie in the recognition of the fact that Christianity as a system of religion—*i.e.*, as a means for bringing man to God through the person of our Lord—is the permanent fact from which all theology starts. Dogmas are intended to preserve this system either by explaining what it involves or by delimiting it from other religious systems. In so far as a new system of theology is really fatal to Christianity as a religion, it stands self-condemned, for it involves the denial of the existence of the thing which it sets out to explain. It therefore falls under the same condemnation as those theories of knowledge which set out to explain how it is possible to have an objective knowledge of the world, and end by proving that such knowledge is impossible. Thus the Church has a perfect right to refuse to alter any doctrine which has formally been accepted as part of the Christian faith, on the ground that *prima facie* the mere fact of such formal acceptance indicates that the article in question has been found in the past to be vital to the existence of the Christian system of religion, and is certainly regarded as vital by a large number of Christians. On the other hand, such a refusal does not necessarily involve the judicial condemnation of those who deny the article in question. Such condemnation should be reserved for those who deny the whole Christian system, and for those who deny the formal Creeds of the Church in a manner calculated to damage the religious life of the ordinary Christian. (A good many modern "restatements" really deserve condemnation not for their actual teaching but for the manner in which they put forward their views.) Both the demand for the formal condemnation of heresy and the demand for revision of the official Creeds of the Church show, in fact, a lack of faith in the guidance of God the Holy Ghost. Provided that it is clearly grasped that the fact of the Christian system of religion as the means of approach to God is the permanent reality which theology can explain but cannot explain away, it may be left to His guidance to show how far any particular doctrine is in fact essential or not. If it be essential it will survive; if not, it may be left to perish of oblivion, except in so far as it contains some element of permanent value, which a new statement will preserve. The method by which this result will be effected will normally be through the investigation of the whole matter by competent theologians, or by the proved capacity of one side to succeed in the object of Christianity, which is the salvation of souls, and the failure of the other.

Thus the function of the Church is from one point of view necessarily conservative, since it is her duty not to abandon doctrines which have been formally accepted as part of her

teaching merely because certain individuals find it difficult to accept them. Her duty is to preserve the eternal truths on which her whole system rests. In particular, it must be remembered that the fact that a particular group of thinkers find themselves able to retain their hold on the essential substance of Christianity while rejecting certain doctrines hitherto regarded as part of that substance, proves very little. Such a school of thinkers could only justify their claim by proving that their revised system was able to win souls as effectively as the old one over a wide period of space and time. If, in fact, they prove able to do this, while the older tradition loses its hold, it will be fairly clear evidence that the truth is on the side of the innovators, and the Church may then fairly consider the readjustment of her formularies in so far as they are definitely contrary to the new teaching. If, on the other hand, both the older teaching and the new prove their power to produce the Christian life in this way, it may be taken to indicate that there is need of some adjustment which it is as yet impossible to make; and the Church can hardly be asked to change her formularies until such an adjustment is possible. If the old survives and the new perishes through failure, *cadit quæstio*. But while the Church cannot reasonably be asked to revise her formularies, it is not necessary or desirable for her to repress the free expression of opinion which aims at preserving the essential values of her message although rejecting the letter of some particular formulary or interpreting it in a new sense. Provided that such views are put forward with charity and courtesy, the Church has no reason to fear them; and it should be the duty of the Church to see that the defenders of her traditional position conduct their controversy in the same spirit. In the meantime the progressive, while advocating his views, should be prepared to submit his judgment to that of the Church to the extent of not quarrelling with her for preserving formularies whose truth he doubts, and whose value he cannot see, pending the decision of time.

It may be objected that such an attitude is dishonest. Such an objection is only true so long as the authority of the Church is looked at from the point of view from which it has too often been regarded in the past as a system of police for the suppression of heresy. Any honest man is bound to express his opinion, if his only reason for abstaining from doing so is the fear of prosecution. If, on the other hand, the authority of the Church is regarded in its proper light, as a corporate tradition, which has in the past proved its power to bring man to God, and is continuing to do so, it is only rational for the individual to put forward his grounds for dissenting from her formal

teaching with a very considerable degree of reserve. He cannot be accused of dishonesty merely because he recognizes that the corporate wisdom of the Church may be greater than his own. He may, and indeed must, put forward his grounds for questioning such formularies, if he is convinced that they are false: but he should be prepared to recognize the possibility that he is not infallible, and to wait until the course of history justifies the Church in accepting his doctrines or his interpretation of doctrines, as against the old ones.

It will, on the other hand, be objected that the toleration of such persons by the Church would result in intellectual anarchy and the paralysis of the Church in her attempts to preach the Gospel. The answer is that as long as it is recognized that the Christian system of religion is the fundamental fact, nothing of the kind will occur. The formal dogmas of the Church will be taught as the basis on which the Christian religion rests. The only difference will be that the progressive will suspect them of being in some respects provisional, rather than eternally true; while the conservative will have to defend them by the use of reason rather than by appeals to the ecclesiastical police. The Church will refuse to modify her formularies at the demand of the individual; but at the same time she will recognize the right of the individual to freedom of speculation, provided that his aim is not manifestly inconsistent with the preservation of the Christian system of religion. At the same time she will be careful to distinguish between her formally defined doctrines and widely held pious opinions.

As a general summary it may be laid down:

1. That the use of forcible methods of suppression (*e.g.*, excommunication, deprivation of benefices, inhibition, etc.) should only be employed, as against the use of rational methods of confuting error, in cases where new views are manifestly fatal to the whole existence of Christianity as a system of religion, or where the method in which they are put forward is calculated to destroy the faith of the simple.

2. That it is not the duty of the Church to modify her formularies except where it can be shown that they are erroneous by a general consensus of those who are really capable of forming a judgment on the matter, and where it is possible to put forward a new statement which will avoid the errors of the old statement, while preserving whatever elements of permanent value it possessed. At the same time the Church should be careful to distinguish her authoritative formularies from widely held opinions or common interpretations of her formularies.

3. It is the duty of the individual scholar to recognize that the authority of the formularies of the Church resides in the

fact that they are the statement of certain truths hitherto found necessary for the preservation of the religious system of Christianity, not on the fact that those who deny them are liable to ecclesiastical penalties. For this reason all such formularies as possess the formal authority of definition by the whole Church are entitled to a very high degree of respect even from the liberal who doubts their ultimate validity, on the ground that they represent a very wide consensus of Christian thought as against his own private opinion. In any case, he should recognize that the formulary embodies an element of truth essential for the preservation of Christianity as a religious system, which any new statement must preserve. The orthodox thinker, even though he denies the possibility of a change of a formulary, should always seek to defend it by reason and not by force; and he should always be ready to recognize the possibility that the critic's speculations may contain an element of truth hitherto unapprehended.

WILFRED L. KNOX.

GEORGE FOX*

I.—SEEKER FOR REALITY

WHEN the Secretary of this Society first asked me to speak about Fox, my impulse was to ask: "But which George Fox do you want? There are too many all to get into one short discourse. Do you wish to hear of George Fox the preacher, or the lover of silence? the rebuker of kings or the friend of humble folk? the tireless traveller or the prisoner in loathsome gaols? Fox the dangerous fanatic, as his enemies considered him, or Fox 'a man altogether of God Almighty's making,' as one of his friends described him after his death?" Gradually, however, my perplexity solved itself. Obviously, whatever else he might be, this man of many aspects was no narrow-minded visionary possessed of but one or two fixed ideas. His life is full of dramatic contrasts; his character had its balancing, almost its conflicting qualities. And yet, in the end, considering him in the most varied scenes and under the most opposite aspects, a final unity does emerge. Every-

* This paper was originally written for the Religious Thought Society in London, an interesting group of people belonging to many different churches and faiths, who meet together regularly each year during the winter months. The subject for the autumn session in 1919 was "Men of the Spirit." The Committee wished the first paper to be by a Quaker about George Fox. Dean Inge gave the second discourse on William Law, the Churchman, while the concluding lecture was by a Wesleyan minister about John Wesley.

thing in his life is made to serve one leading purpose. Everywhere, at all times and in all places, he is George Fox, the SEEKER FOR REALITY.

Having cleared my own mind on this point, a second letter arrived saying that the Society wished specially to hear about Fox's mystical experiences. But, though this seemed contradictory at first, it really led me to the same conclusion by a different road; for Reality is surely the goal of every true mystic's quest and of none more than George Fox. In his Journal he tells of his supersensual experiences in the same tone of calm certainty with which he describes everyday affairs. "This I knew experimentally," he states, with magnificent daring, of his supreme revelation. He is absolutely sure that he is describing no "cloud cuckoo land" of the spirit but the essential reality of things.* "Truth is substantial," he declares in another place; and therefore, persuaded of this, he does not hesitate to submit his revelations to the most searching of all tests. He offers them for verification not to theological experts, not to elect, supersensitive souls, but to ordinary men and women everywhere, to be tried and proved in the ordeals of daily life; and he so offers them, not to his contemporaries alone. Many of us, in our widely different age, are persuaded that his discoveries are true because we find them still good and useful to live by in our new and perplexing world. "The eternal verities remain"; and they alone never grow old.

Fox fearlessly acted out his beliefs. His master quality has been well said to be his "complete reliance on the truth he knew." He has enabled those who come after him and follow his methods to "know truth experimentally" in their measure also. He did this in various ways, but perhaps chiefly by sharing the deepest experiences of his life with others, persuaded that the truths he had discovered were meant to be the inheritance of all men.

"Read it as if it were a modern autobiography, written yesterday," said the wise friend who first put St. Augustine's *Confessions* into my hand. That is the way to read George Fox, in his own Journal and in the Cambridge Edition if possible, which preserves the original ruggedness of speech and allows him to tell his own story in his own words.

Here he reveals himself with his strong lights and shadows, setting down his weaknesses and errors of judgment with the same impartiality with which he shows his tenderness, his humour, and, above all, the invincible singleness of purpose that was the secret of his power. The outward facts of his life

* I use the word "Reality" throughout in no technical sense but in its simplest meaning of genuineness.

are well known here. Not one of us but remembers how at last, after his stormy, troubled years of youthful searching, after he had consulted all the Puritan "priests and professors" in vain, "Then, O then," he says, "I heard a Voice that said: 'There is one even Christ Jesus that can speak to thy condition.' When I heard it my heart did leap for joy. Thus when God doth work who shall let it? *This I knew experimentally.*"

Reality is real. A divine Teacher is still speaking within the troubled heart of man. Man's part is to listen, and not to suffer outward sounds to drown this inward Voice. Everything else follows naturally from this central truth. Henceforward Fox's spiritual Universe was sure. The central sun was real, was assuredly there, holding all things together. However much clouds and darkness hereafter might veil or even hide the sunshine for a time, in the end they were certain to be dispelled by his great certainty of God.

Thus, after long search, though in his early manhood, Reality was found. Fox devoted the rest of his life to following this great central truth into its furthest implications, seeking to make his own life, and the lives of others, real also, down to their smallest details.

The Quaker testimonies that provoked their opponents sprang—most of them—from this consuming passion for Reality worked out with an almost ludicrous—or, let us say, Pre-Raphaelite—precision of detail. For instance, the custom of addressing one person as if he were two or more as a mark of respect with the plural pronoun was an obviously unreal form of politeness. Hence the "plain language," and the absence of all titles of courtesy, which provoked bitterer opposition than many of the far more important truths that the Quakers proclaimed.

In our free and easy age some of the points on which they insisted do seem (let us in our turn be real enough, and honest enough, to confess the fact) absurdly small. It is easier to understand and admire Fox's love of simplicity of dress in the abstract than to sympathize with his denunciation of the two useless buttons on the back of every man's coat, because they have long ago lost their real original function of buttoning. Yet, while we smile, his words on dress have not altogether lost their point even to-day. "Away with your long slit peaks behind," he writes, ". . . and your short sleeves and pinchin your shoulders, your skimdish hats and unnecessary buttons. . . . Away with your bare necks. . . . In all things be plain that ye may adorn the truth of the gospel of Christ and keep in that which is comely and decent."

A prophet and seer inevitably has a scale of values other

than ours. To him there is no "small" or "great," but only the vital distinction between "true" and "false." Let us remember and honour Fox for the witness he bore, when, at Launceston for instance, he braved for weeks the unspeakable horrors of imprisonment even in Doomsdale as blithely for what may seem to us the mere scruple about not taking off his hat, as he would have done for his vital principle of obedience to "That of God within." But our concern to-day is less with the outer quest for Reality in the Society Fox founded than with the inward search for truth of the man himself. Therefore his perpetual journeyings not only up and down the length and breadth of England, but also on the other side of the Atlantic, as well as the long and terrible imprisonments by which these journeys were too often interrupted, can only be mentioned in passing. If these ordeals sapped his physical strength, they did but increase his spiritual vigour in "Publishing Truth" and "Settling Friends."

In his Journal the mystical side is less prominent in later life, but it still peeps out here and there. Plainly to him all his outward hardships, journeys, sorrows, joys, and adventures were but as so many beads threaded on the string—unseen, but real—that connected his own soul with the Divine.

II.—HIS MYSTICAL EXPERIENCES

"Mystical Experiences" seems at first hardly a robust enough expression to describe the inward life of Fox. The phrase suggests some wan, pale anchorite, some ethereal nun, like the sister of Sir Percival who "prayed and fasted till the sun shone and the wind blew through her," rather than the square-set, bulky figure of this tireless horseman and dweller in the open air. In many cases mystical "shewings" are interwoven with physical suffering, either self-inflicted (as in the case of Suso), or through ill-health (in the Revelations given to Juliana of Norwich), whereas Fox's most striking glimpses within the veil seem, on the other hand, generally to have come to him out of doors, often when riding or walking, either alone or in company. He tells the story of one of his youthful "openings" quite simply: "As I was walking in the fields the Lord said unto me, 'Thy name is written in the Lamb's Book of Life,' and as the Lord said it, I believed, and saw it in the new birth." Wordsworth, a later mystic, could scarcely narrate his first sight of the dancing daffodils more naturally and more objectively. But though Fox's "openings" sometimes came through words spoken to his inward ear, he more often describes what he "saw" into the inward reality of things.

Even so, but with the specialized Hebrew phrase for prophetic seeing, did that other greater country herdsman, Amos of Tekoa, report the " words which he saw " concerning Israel in the days of Uzziah the king; while Mechtild of Magdeburg, a mediæval mystic, says of her Revelations: " The writing of this book was seen, heard, and experienced in every limb. . . . I see it with the eye of my soul and hear it with the ears of my eternal spirit " (*Mysticism*, E. Underhill).

In the same land of mystical reality Fox also, when still but a youth of twenty-three, says: " I *saw* the great love of God, and was filled with admiration at the infiniteness of it."

And again: " I *saw* into that which was without end, things which cannot be uttered."

With Dante and most of the greatest seers of all ages Fox insists continually that his words fall far short of the realities he is trying to describe. Is not this the distinction between a sentimentalist and a true seer? The former, the sentimentalist, wraps his small visions in words too large for them—decks them out with hanging drapery of metaphor, cunning embroidery of speech—while the true seer confesses with shame that, try as he will, he cannot stretch mere human language sufficiently to describe more than a tiny part of the overwhelming Reality of which he has been made aware.

" I saw into . . . things which cannot be uttered. . . ." Fox first cautions his hearers and then the vision comes: " For I had been brought through the very ocean of death. . . . I saw also that there was an ocean of darkness and death; but an infinite ocean of light and love which flowed over the darkness."

Dante, too, had a sight of that ocean of darkness and death, the " perilous water " from which he had barely escaped. Fox does not merely look back at the darkness " with soul that still was fleeing," as Dante did; he looks on beyond it, sees it in perspective, and brings back from the sight an unconquerable faith. How should we have lived through the last ten years, how should we dare to cast our eyes over that state of the world to-day, without the comfort, the reality, of this shewing: the " infinite ocean of light and love flowing over the darkness," hard though it may be for us to believe that it is really there? Many of Fox's most characteristic " openings " and " seeings " date from these anguished years of seeking in his youth. The truths he then discovered remained for the rest of his life impressed not only upon his heart as facts but also upon his language as metaphors.

This is especially true of his most famous simile of the " Inward Light." It occurs first in his Journal for the year

1648 when, as a lad of nineteen, he says: "I was commanded to turn people to that inward light, spirit and grace by which all men might know their salvation and their way to God."

More than half a century later one of his converts, writing after the death of Fox, adds his testimony as to how this commission, given so long before, had been carried out.

"The Lord did very wonderfully appear in him," he says, "whereof I am a living witness. When I first went to him he treated me in meekness like a lamb, and said: 'Young man, This is the word of the Lord to thee: There are three Scriptures thou must witness to be fulfilled. . . . First, thou must be changed from darkness to light; next, thou must come to know the knowledge of the glory of God; and then thou must be changed from glory to glory.'" "Mystical experience" this? Yes, it may be called so. But it is also profoundly practical doctrine to give to a young man.

In one of Fox's early visions he saw Christ sitting as a Refiner of silver. From this sight came to him a persuasion of the Reality of spiritual light and spiritual fire which took possession of him once for all.

"The divine light of Christ manifesteth all things, the spiritual fire trieth and severeth all things. . . . These things were opened to me in the light." It would be interesting to know whether he had ever heard that traditional, unwritten "saying" of our Lord: "He that is near me is near the fire."

Yet, in the concrete experience of daily life it was by no mystical fire but by the side of a humble cottage hearth that he underwent the memorable experience in the Vale of Beavor.

"One morning," he writes, "I was sitting by the fire, and a great cloud came over me, and I sat still. It was said: 'All things come by nature,' and the elements and stars came over me so that I was quite clouded by it. But as I sat still under it and let it alone, a living hope and a true voice arose in me which said: 'There is a living God who made all things.' Immediately the cloud and temptation vanished and life rose over it all and my heart was glad and I praised the living God. After some time I met with some people who had a notion that there was no God and that all things come by nature. I had a great dispute with them and overturned them and made some of them confess that there is a living God. Then I saw that it was good that I had gone through that exercise."

This is a characteristic example of Fox's method of dealing with his mystical experiences. He does not wrap himself up in them, apart from mankind. Rather he wrings from them new power to help his fellow-men. And the order of events is instructive. First the sudden overshadowing of the cloud,

known only to himself, unnoticed by those sitting by. Then his patient waiting for fuller light as he " sat still and let it alone." Then follows the " true voice " that dispels his bewilderment. Finally, but not till some time later, the " needs be " for the whole discipline is made plain, in the power thereby acquired to dispel similar clouds in the minds of others. Fox is not self-centred even in his most solitary ordeals. The thought " for their sakes " shines through them like a gleaming thread of fellowship.

Luther declares somewhere that three exercises are necessary to make a divine: prayer, meditation, and temptation. Strangely enough, in Fox the sense of personal sinfulness is markedly absent. " While I was a child," he states, " I was taught how to be kept pure." Later on, after speaking of the sins of his youthful companions, he added comprehensively, " which things I was never addicted to." His constant travelling companion and friend, Leonard Fell, testified after Fox's death, " For many years that I frequented his company I never saw anything of him but that he was kept from the spots of the world." Many of us can appreciate this testimony, being only too conscious that, on a journey, we ourselves are apt to travel " with all our seams outside."

In the Journal, therefore, apart from the early pages, his " temptations and despairs," the anguished note of remorse for personal sinfulness is markedly absent. Yet Fox is far from being self-righteous. He merely will not pose or pretend to an attitude even of penitence that he does not really feel.

His sense of sin must have been both keen and at times overwhelming, only it seems to have been the sense of the world's sin that weighed him down to the extent of causing him grievous physical suffering. His Journal records at least three such " dark " seasons, lasting for many weeks, of combined bodily and spiritual gloom.

Two of these, in later life, came at special crises when the springs of national life seemed to him to be being poisoned. In his last illness he says: " I felt the misery of my fellow-creatures, *separated from the divine harmony*, and it was heavier than I could bear, and I was crushed down under it." Yet, even in his darkest hours, he never seems to have wholly lost the assurance that his own sufferings could and would be made of use to others.

" He bears the iniquity wherever he comes," was the testimony of a friend in Barbadoes after his visit there.

In one of the many passages that recall the slightly earlier seer, Jacob Behmen (by whom he was undoubtedly influenced, though the two men can never have met in the flesh), Fox declares that, " The nature of dogs, swine, vipers, of Sodom

and Egypt, Pharaoh, Cain, Ishmael, Esau, . . . I saw within, though people had been looking without." Like Behmen, Fox seems to have had a curious horror of dogs. "I saw a dog-like nature in him," is one of Fox's strongest condemnations of an opponent. But if he did not appreciate dogs, he had a true Englishman's love of a good horse. There is a sharp judgment in his Journal on a cheating ostler, "who was filling his pockets with the provender that was given to my horse, a wicked, thievish people to rob the poor dumb creature of his food; I had rather he had robbed me."

A year later he came to Scotland, riding, maybe, upon the same steed whose food he had rescued. "When I set my horse's feet atop of Scottish ground," he writes, "I felt the seed of God to sparkle about me like innumerable sparks of fire."

Moreover, the sight of Fox on horseback, as he rode undaunted through a mob of students assembled in Cambridge streets to attack him, struck them with sudden and unexpected terror. "Oh! Oh!" they cried, "he shines, he glisters!" Involuntarily they shrank aside and let Fox ride through their midst unscathed, though his comrade, a former officer of Cromwell's Ironsides, was unhorsed and roughly handled before he could get to an inn.

This power to quell unruly and turbulent spirits, not with outward weapons but by inward spiritual force, was one of the tests of Reality which Fox practised himself and enjoined upon his followers. Quaker quiet and Quaker peacefulness must prove their power by being able to subdue their opposites. Our testimony for peace is not so much a thing to be talked about as a thing to be tried on the next furious or unreasonable person we may meet. The surprise of finding that his method (which, after all, was his Master's method before him) still works, brings Fox and the spiritual laws he lived by very near.

"Come out of the bustlings, you that are bustling," he commands, "and in strife against one another, whose spirits are not quieted" (*Gospel Truth Demonstrated*, 995).

"Keep down and be master over all the passions and the hasty and cross spirits" (*Epistle*, 175).

And again, "Friends, go not into the aggravating part to strive with it, lest you do hurt to your own souls and run into the same nature, for patience must get the victory and it answers to the witness of God in everyone and will bring everyone from the contrary" (*Ep.*, 109).

"Put on courage; put on patience, feeling the power of God preaching and reaching the witness of God in everyone when words are not uttered" (*Ep.*, 208). This practice of patience among the rubs and trials of daily life is closely allied to the

attitude of silent waiting which Fox believed to be the best way to attain to spiritual truth and power.

" Stand still in that which shews and discovers," he counsels, " and then doth strength immediately come." Yet he knows that this advice will not be acceptable to all, only to " chosen Jacob." " For tell Esau of a silent meeting and he will hunt until he hath tired himself " (*G.T.D.*, 100). Yet even " hunting Esau " must be treated with patience, not despair. For hidden in him, too, somewhere, there must be the " tender thing " that can be helped or hindered in its upward growth.

What is this " tender thing," this " Seed," this " Inward Light," or " true Teacher which is within "? Surely all these different images are attempts to convey the central truth that the human and the divine are closely related, that contact with Reality was never meant to be the heritage of a few elect souls, but is the right and privilege of all men. Thus, as W. C. Braithwaite finely says, " The Inward Light was the artificer of the Church and its bond of fellowship " (*Second Period of Quakerism*, p. 401). This belief made it impossible for Fox and the early Quakers to fight even in a good cause, since to slay a fellow-man was to destroy, as far as this world was concerned, " That of God " within him, and was therefore an injury to the divine life itself.

Fox, as a young man, suffered months of imprisonment rather than accept an officer's commission in the army that seemed to him to be on the right side, even when England's future and England's freedom were at stake. He refused because he " had seen to the end of fighting." " Dwelling in the Word," he writes in later life, " it takes away the occasion of wars and gathers our hearts together unto God." A Methodist minister, who has recently become persuaded of the unlawfulness of war, wrote to me a few weeks ago: " It is so wonderful to be able to *read* the New Testament now, not to have to explain it away." This is the thought of Fox in modern language.

The same search for Reality made him call his followers to be partakers of " the nearer Supper " rather than to partake of the elements of bread and wine. " For I say the marriage supper of the Lamb is a nearer supper, to hear Christ's voice after he is risen and ascended, and to let him into their hearts, and He to sup with them and they with Him that's within them " (*Gospel Truth Demonstrated*, p. 910).

To describe the Reality of the baptism that Quakers believe to be necessary, I choose a passage not from Fox but from the pen of one of his contemporaries, William Dell, in his youth a loyal Churchman and secretary to Archbishop Laud, who became later convinced of Quaker truths.

"The truth must eat out the ceremony," he writes, "and the substance the sign: the more the baptism of Christ comes in, the more the baptism of water will go out. . . . The baptism of fire shall devour, or 'lick up' the baptism of water, and Christ's spirit baptism by degrees shall put an end to water baptism."

It would not be fair to George Fox to omit to mention these matters in which his search for Reality led him to adopt a different course from that of most other Christian bodies. But I have no wish to argue about them. "Let every man be firmly persuaded in his own mind." Though "To your own! To your own!" (*i.e.*, "To your own individual guidance") was the watchword of Fox to his followers in his younger days, in later life he insisted more on the balancing truth: "Keep to the Unity," and "All rents are jarrings and schisms are out of the spirit."

"And the light will lead you"—these are his own words—"to be taught alone of God, who teacheth eternal things eternally. Whom God loves, He loves to the end. Where the eternal unity is, there is all peace, all clean, no jar. . . . Here grace grows, here's God alone glorified, and the unknown truth made manifest which draws up that which lies in the prison and refresheth it *in Time*, up to God, *out of Time, through Time*. . . ." "So Glory to God" (I am now quoting from his farewell letter to Friends, left to be opened after his death), "through Christ in this age and all ages, who is God with us, over all, the beginning and the ending: in Him live and walk, in whom you have life eternal: in whom you will feel me and I you."

And we do many of us feel him, a very present reality in our life and thought to-day.

L. V. Hodgkin.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

We are glad to welcome a striking new venture now being considered by the English Church Union. A Literature Committee, presided over by the Rev. Dr. Harris, has presented a comprehensive Report advocating various projects of literary work of a scholarly character for the defence and promotion of the Catholic Faith. The Report is summarized in the *Church Union Gazette* for June. The support and interest of a number of scholars of recognized standing have been enlisted; and an extensive programme of publication has been prepared, including various apologetic manuals, a one-volume Bible Commentary, and a book of Essays on Anglo-Catholic lines. Lectures, classes, and study circles are also warmly advocated. An interesting new departure is the proposal that the avenues offered by the Student Christian Movement for reaching the younger men and women in our Colleges should be welcomed and made use of. The Report, which owes much to the encouragement of the President and other officers of the English Church Union, has been referred to local branches for endorsement; and we understand that it has been received with enthusiasm. As the Report says: "The E.C.U. is already a learned society to a much greater extent than is usually supposed"; and it is hoped that, if the policy outlined be adopted, "the Union will soon rank, both in fact and in public estimation, as a learned society fundamentally interested in the study of the Faith in its relation to modern thought and modern life."

A recent issue of the Italian monthly Journal *Bilychnis* contains a careful résumé of the Rev. E. C. Hoskyns's article on "Galilee of the Gentiles," which appeared in Theology in September, 1923.

Our correspondence has been more than usually varied lately.

A West Indian priest working in French Guinea writes to ask for assistance in combating a peculiar kind of false teaching, apparently Gnostic in character, known as "Russellism." We have referred his letter to the S.P.C.K., who have written to him fully.

A German lady, who had read Mr. Lowther Clarke's review of Heiler's book entitled "Evangelical Catholicism" (Theology, February, 1924), writes with regard to the High Church Union in the Lutheran Church. She says: "A part of the members, and I venture to say those who know best their own minds, are especially interested in an approach to the English Catholic Church, which they think will be the centre of the re-united Christendom."

The June issue of *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (Louvain) contains a contribution from P. Hocedez, S.J., entitled "Une Découverte Theologique." The reference is to a recently discovered bull of Boniface IX. (1400), giving to the abbot of St. Osith (in Essex) the right of conferring the priesthood. P. Hocedez considers that this bull, if it prove to be genuine, will seriously compromise the modern view that "episcopal consecration is a sacrament" and "confers character," and will support the Thomist view that it merely completes priestly ordination and extends its power.

This question, which has been alive in theology ever since the days of St. Jerome, is very fully discussed, with especial reference to scholastic discussions of it, by Dr. John Forbes of Aberdeen in the second Book of his *Irenicum*, chapter xi. He maintains the thesis that priests and bishops are alike in possessing "aptitude" for ordaining others: but that bishops possess also the "jurisdiction" which permits them to do it, as representing the whole Church. Forbes contended that, where bishops were not to be had, their jurisdiction, in this as in other matters, passed to the body of presbyters. Note F in Gore's *The Church and the Ministry* (espec. p. 340) is also in point here.

We are glad to publish an article by Mrs. John Holdsworth (L. Violet Hodgkin) on George Fox, whose tercentenary is being kept this month, though the exact date of his birth is unknown. A new edition of his Journal by Norman Penney, F.S.A., has lately been published by J. M. Dent and Sons, price 5s.: we shall hope to review it in due course.

The Bishop of Winchester's Presidential address to his Diocesan Conference on June 3 contained an interesting allusion to Fr. Kelly's article on "The Parish," which appeared in our May number. The Bishop strongly endorsed Fr. Kelly's plea for a wider basis of Church fellowship than the parish alone provides.

The editor would be obliged if books for review in THEOLOGY might in all cases be sent, not to himself direct, but to the Secretaries, S.P.C.K., with whom the arrangement of reviews and notices now normally rests. They are always willing to send to the editor any books for which he specially makes request.

We have received a pamphlet entitled "The Christian Social Movement in England," by Maurice B. Reckitt, being the reprint of an article in *The Journal of Religion*, vol. iv., No. 2. He alludes to a report by members of the Church Socialist League on "Social Credit and Christian Values," which we also acknowledge.

CORRESPONDENCE

INVOCATION IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST

SIR,

Having read the article of the Dean of Wells on this subject in your February issue, I should like, with your permission, to make some remarks upon it. Let me say at the outset, that I so far agree with the Dean, that I am not concerned to advocate the introduction of an invocation into our rite, unless it be in the position it occupies in the Mass of 1549; and that, in any case, I should deplore the adoption for any purpose of the "Grey Book" canon in its present ungainly and incoherent shape. But otherwise the Dean's article seems to me to be full of what is dubious enough, to say the least of it.

1. The opening statement that "the power of the Divine Name was a central conception in Hebrew religion" is surely rather extravagant,

nor does it seem to me to be plausible to suggest that Christian scribes, in accepting a convention from the Jewish scribes of the LXX, and in perpetuating and extending it in the text of the New Testament, intended to conceal or half-conceal the Sacred Names because of "the power inherent in" them, or indeed to conceal them at all for any reason. But, however this may be, the Dean of Wells tells us that his "preliminary observation" on the potency of names "enables us to understand the importance attached to the hallowing of persons and places by putting the Divine Name upon them." The phrase "to put a name upon," except in the Aramaic of Dan. v. 12, where it means simply "to name" or "to surname," occurs only once in the Old Testament, and that in reference to the Aaronic blessing (Num. vi. 27), and this is a prayer which does indeed repeat the Divine Name thrice, but does not obviously suggest that its effect is to be expected from any "power inherent in the Name." But it is not to this passage that Dr. Robinson expressly appeals, but to "this house whereupon thy Name is called," and "thy Name hath been called upon us," interpreting these phrases to mean that "on His temple and on His people the hallowing Name has been invoked." But I do not gather that there is any question that the phrase "the name" of A "is called upon" a person or a thing has nothing to do with "invocation," but means simply that the person or thing becomes the possession of A, and falls under his authority (Gen. xlviii. 16; 2 Sam. xii. 28; Ps. xlviii. 12; Isa. iv. 1). If the name is the Divine Name, no doubt the phrase may be said to imply "hallowing," in so far as to be consecrated means to belong to God: but the "hallowing" is not effected by any human invocation, but rather "the Name is called upon" the person or thing by God Himself, who takes possession of it. Next the Dean tells us that the Greek for this imagined "naming or invoking" is ἐπικαλεῖν, which he says (evidently after consulting the *Thesaurus* of Stephanus) "means first of all simply to 'name' or sometimes to 'surname,'" and "presently (especially in the middle voice, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι) gets the meaning to 'appeal by name'"; and finally the "verb acquires the further meaning of invitation." As to all this, I will venture to say first, that I see no reason to suppose that these are chronologically successive and not contemporaneous and co-ordinate meanings of the word; secondly, that so far as the active verb is concerned, the meaning "appeal by name" is not a new meaning, but is simply "to name" as it is used in relation to prayers—*e.g.*, in the example quoted by the Dean from Herodian, the obvious meaning is, "They prayed and named the gods who were being wronged," *i.e.*, addressed their prayer to those gods in particular; and thirdly, that it seems to me that ἐπικαλεῖσθαι, in the sense in which we are concerned with it, is not the middle of ἐπικαλεῖν in the sense of "to name" or "appeal by name" (if indeed the verb in this sense has a middle), but means "to call to oneself," "to call in" as we "call in" an ally, an assistant, or a witness.

In the article in the *Downside Review* to which Dr. Robinson refers, Dom Connolly affirms that in ἐπικαλεῖσθαι the preposition governs the direct object, the person addressed, and not the indirect object in reference to which he is addressed. I am bold enough to affirm the precise contrary, that the preposition always governs the indirect object, and this both in the verb and in the substantive ἐπίκλησις, the relation to the indirect object being determined by the several meanings of the preposition. Consequently besides the quite general meaning of "a calling to" or

"in," an invitation or petition to intervene, it seems to me that ἐπίκλησις can and, I suspect, does have two specific meanings in Christian language. First, "a calling on to" a particular person or thing; so that "the *epiklesis* of the Holy Ghost" which, as the Dean says, "appears for the first time, as it would seem in Christian literature" in St. Cyril of Jerusalem, just sums up his prayer to "God the lover of man" to "send forth the Holy Ghost *on to* the gifts set forth," and means the "calling for the Holy Ghost" *on to* the oblation. So Symeon of Thessalonica in the fourteenth century uses the phrase of the consecration of the font, or the forms of ordination, as well as of the consecration of the Eucharist;* and these forms were then, what they are now, prayers for the coming of the Eternal Spirit on to the subjects of consecration, and involved no appeal to names. And secondly, ἐπᾴδειν, ἐπίρρησις, ἐπεύχεσθαι are used in classical Greek of singing, speaking, praying "over" a person or thing; Origen describes the consecration of the Eucharist as "praying over the bread," "the prayer made over it," "the word said over it"†; and, contrary to classical usage, ἐπονομάζειν, ἐπιλέγειν are used in Christian language of naming and saying "over," and ἐπίλογος of what is said "over" a person or thing‡; and similarly it seems to me at least quite possible that a form of exorcism is called *epiklesis* by Irenæus§, and the baptismal formula by Origen (as it is also by Symeon of Thessalonica‖), and the Eucharistic invocation is called by St. Cyril "the epiklesis of the Holy Trinity,"¶ not so much, if at all, because the formulæ involve the use of names, as because they are "called over" the persons or things in relation to which they are used.

Consequently I, for one, do not "feel that," in the passages on the Eucharist which the Dean of Wells quotes from St. Irenæus, Origen, and St. Ambrose, "what is in question is not a petition . . . but a naming of the Sacred Name of God by way of consecration"; nor do I think he is in the least justified in translating *epiklesis* by "invocation of the Divine Name." And, in fact, I know of only two writers who attribute consecration to the invocation of the Name. One is Origen, whom the Dean quotes: but when Origen is more explicit he shows what was the form of this invocation: the Eucharist is "the loaves offered with thanksgiving and prayer over the gifts" (*c. Cels.* viii. 33), and we have already noticed other ways in which he describes consecration. The other writer is St. Cæsarius of Arles: "When the creatures to be blessed with the heavenly words are placed upon the sacred altars, before they are consecrated by the invocation of the holy Name the substance of bread and wine is there; but after the words of Christ the body of Christ is there" (*Hom.* v. *de Pascha*); where "the invocation" is clearly the words of institution themselves. It is a sorry resource, not to say a *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole story, when Dr. Robinson and Dom Connolly suggest that the Eucharistia of the Liturgy is an *epiklesis* in their sense because it ends with a doxology containing the Name of the Holy Trinity: with which Origen himself says that all prayer ought to end (*de Orat.* 33), and most solemn Christian prayers, in fact, do end, among the exceptions being the anaphora of the original East Syrian rite of SS. Adai and Mari.**

* *De Divino Templo* 88 (Migne *P.G.* clv. 735).
† *Sel. in Ezech.* 7; *in Mat.* xi. 14.
‡ St. Just. M. *Ap.* i. 61 § 10, 66 § 4; St. Iren. *Haer.* i. 13 § 2.
§ *Epideixis* 96. ‖ *In Joan.* iii. 5. ¶ *Cat. Myst.* i. 7.
** See further Mr. Tyrer's article "The Meaning of ἐπίκλησις" in *Journal of Theological Studies*, January, 1924.

2. In the year 348 we find in the *Catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem what Dr. Robinson describes, not very consistently, as the culmination of "this conception of the hallowing power of invocation" (viz., as a naming of potent names) and "a new line of thought quite distinct from anything that we have found in earlier writers in connection with the Invocation of the Divine Name." This alleged novelty is "a definite petition for the Holy Spirit's advent to transform the elements." Within a few years of this we have in the Egyptian anaphora of Sarapion of Thmuis, with one exception, to which I will come in a moment, the first clear evidence for the presence of the recital of the Institution in the Liturgy; but not as the form of consecration, since it is followed by a "definite" invocation, not now of the Holy Ghost, but of the Eternal Word; and it is not till some thirty years later, in the *de Mysteriis* of St. Ambrose, that we find the first clear evidence for the conception of consecration as effected by the recital of our Lord's own words. On the other hand, in the second half of the third century, say in 275, the Syrian *Didaskalia apostolorum* quite unambiguously ascribes consecration at once to invocation and to the Holy Ghost; and in fact to invocation *of* the Holy Ghost; for the bread is said to be "made by fire, and consecrated by invocation," and "made by fire" has no relevancy or sense unless the "invocation" was of the "fire" of the Holy Ghost.* So far, then, our evidence for consecration by invocation of the Holy Ghost, whether "definite" or "indefinite" we do not know, is a century older than that for consecration by the recital of the Institution. Before this, with the same one exception as before, all is quite general and indefinite or at least of doubtful interpretation: the anaphora is described as consisting of "praise and glory and thanksgiving," "prayer," "prayers and thanksgivings," "invocation," "the invocation of God," "the utterance of prayer that comes from Him," "the word of God," and prayer (from 1 Tim. iv. 5), and so on.

The one exception I have mentioned is the anaphora of St. Hippolytus of the beginning of the third century, which contains both the Institution and an "indefinite" invocation of the Holy Ghost. Dr. Robinson dismisses this very summarily: it is "too early" in date "to offer evidence for the formal use of the" Roman Church, since "it belongs to the period when liturgical forms were dependent on the will of the presiding bishop, the general scheme of the service alone being fixed." But how does the Dean know that the drift and structure, apart from the particular wording, of the anaphora was not as fixed as was the scheme of the Liturgy as a whole? I am inclined myself to suspect that the text itself suggests that the structure of the anaphora was already so fixed. And anyhow it is a curious accident, if accident it is, that the construction of this anaphora happens to be precisely that of most of the Liturgies so soon as we know anything about them in detail. There is some further criticism that might be made of Dr. Robinson's treatment of this rite, but I should take up too much of your space if I suggested it.

3. Towards the end of his article the Dean of Wells sets out the conceptions of consecration in East and West respectively. The "fundamental idea" of the Western conception, he says, is that our Lord comes to be present in the congregation, and there by the mouth of His minister repeats the words of the Institution at the Last Supper. This is no doubt a legitimate deduction from the use of the words as the form of consecra-

* *Didask.* vi. 21 § 2, 22 § 2 (ed. Funk).

tion, a deduction I dare say which has been made by English divines, and certainly has been by Latins; though whether it can rightly be described as "the doctrine of the English Church" is another question. But when the Dean goes on to say, "This is the teaching of the Western Church from the time of Justin onwards," it is more difficult to follow him. He does not explain how he derives this teaching from Justin, but only adds, "The *Logos*, as he would phrase it, identifies Himself with the Bread and Wine." What St. Justin does say is nothing so extravagant as this, nor anything much like it, but "we have been taught that the food consecrated by the utterance of prayer that comes from Him is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh" (*Apol.* i. 66). I can only conjecture that Dr. Robinson understands the much-disputed words "by the utterance of prayer that comes from Him" to refer to the Words of Institution. I do not myself agree with this interpretation: but anyhow words of such confessedly doubtful interpretation are a quite insecure ground for the positive assertion that the Western view is as old as Justin. Further, there is nothing peculiarly Western in the conception of our Lord as the true Priest and Consecrator in the Divine Liturgy; for surely there is no one who oftener or with more emphasis asserts it than St. John Chrysostom (*Hom.* i. *de proditione Judæ* 6; *Hom.* ii. *in* 2 *Tim.* 1; *Hom.* lxxxii. [lxxxiii.] *in Matt.* 5); and it is expressed in the Liturgy of Constantinople itself: "Thou art the offerer and the offered."

"The Eastern Church," on the other hand, we are told, "working out the parallel with the Incarnation upon other lines, has sought to introduce the action of the" Holy Ghost, "as in the Conception from [*sic*] the Virgin, so also to bring about the change of the elements into the sacred Body and Blood of Christ." This parallel is drawn by some Eastern divines, more, of course, than I know of; and no doubt it would be accepted by all Orientals. But whether it was the real point of departure for the formation of the Eastern conception, I should think is open to doubt. But however this may be, it is to be noticed that St. John of Damascus, in drawing the parallel, refers both of the operations of the Eternal Spirit to a principle, the ignoring of which throughout his article gives a strange colour to Dr. Robinson's theology—the principle, viz., that "all things whatsoever God did, He did by the operation of the Holy Ghost."* But here again there is no contrast between East and West: for the same parallel between the two operations of the Holy Ghost is drawn by Western divines† quite as definitely and explicitly as it is by St. John of Damascus or St. Nikephoros.

Further, there is a Greek representation of consecration as old as the fourth or fifth century, which emerges also later from time to time, taking this form: As the primeval creative word, *Let the earth bring forth*, etc., is effective for all time and is realized year by year through the fall of the rain; so the original words of the Institution of the Eucharist are effective "till He come," and are realized from moment to moment through the "rain" of the Holy Spirit invoked in the Divine Liturgy.‡ Here, then, we have an Eastern conception, more or less figuratively expressed, which combines the Eastern and Western conceptions, and justifies both. On

* *De Fide Orthod.*, iv. 13.

† *E.g.* St. Fulgent. *ad Monim.* ii. 10; St. Greg. M. ap. Paul. Diac. *Vita Greg.* 23; Paschas. Radb. *de Corpore et Sanguine Dom.* 12.

‡ See [Ephraim Syr.] *Opp. græc.* iii. p. 608; St. Chrys. *de Prodit. Iudae* i. 6; St. Jo. Dam. *de Fide Orthod.*, iv. 13.

the other hand, in the West there is the line of divines, reaching from St. Gregory the Great, down to St. Thomas Aquinas and Durandus,* and perhaps including implicitly everybody else, who, while holding the Western view, at the same time recognize that the Words of Institution, considered as the form of consecration, are effective through the operation of the Holy Ghost.

Let me here quote two passages from ninth-century Latin divines.

"He speaks daily in His priests. They discharge their office, He operates by the majesty of divine power. . . . He by the power of the Spirit the Paraclete and by a heavenly benediction makes his holy body and blood to be" (Florus of Lyons *Expositio canonis* 84).

"We ought to believe truly and to know without doubt that within the Catholic Church, where this mystery is celebrated with Catholic faith, nothing more is received from a good priest and nothing less from an evil, so long as it is catholicly consecrated: since it is effected, not by [*in*] the merit of the consecrator, but by [*in*] the word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Ghost, that the flesh and blood of Christ is believed by true faith, and that [flesh] none other than that which was created by the Holy Ghost. . . . As it is Christ who baptizes, so it is He Who by the Holy Ghost makes [the bread] His own flesh and transforms [the wine] into His blood. For who else [than the Holy Ghost] was able to create in the womb, so that *the Word was made flesh?* So also in this mystery it must be believed that by the same power of the Holy Ghost, through the word of Christ, His flesh and blood is brought about by an invisible operation. Hence also it is that the priest says, *Command these things to be carried by the hands of thy holy angel on to thine altar on high in the sight of thy divine majesty.* Why does he pray that they be carried thither save that it may be understood that these things are wrought by [*in*] His priesthood? For He was *made an highpriest for ever after the order of Melchisedek*, as the Apostle testifies, *to make intercession for us*, offering Himself to God the Father" (Paschasius Radbert *de Corpore et Sanguine Domini* 12).

In these two passages of Western divines of the Roman rite we have, combined into a single whole, all the conceptions which the Dean of Wells separates, and distributes between East and West: Christ our Lord as the true Priest and Consecrator in each celebration of the Liturgy, repeating His Words of Institution by the mouth of His human minister, and the Eternal Spirit operating the consecration, as also He operated the Incarnation. Consequently, I cannot accept the Dean's assertion that the ideas of East and West are "profoundly different"; and so far from assenting when he "urges that the two ideas should be kept distinct in our minds," I would urge that they be held together, whatever superficial quarrel there may have been between them in the past.

4. The Dean of Wells treats the invocation of the Holy Ghost as a purely Eastern institution. But (*a*) as is well enough known, the Church of Africa had such an invocation in its Liturgy†; (*b*) the evidence of St. Ambrose for an invocation at Milan, which is quoted by the Dean himself, whatever difficulties it may suggest, cannot be ignored, but must be either

* See reff. in Hoppe *Die Epiklesis*, pp. 250 *sq.*; St. Tho. Aq. *Summa*, III. lxxxvii. 4 ad 1.

† St. Optatus *c. Donat.* vi. 1; St. Fulgentius *ad Monim.* ii. 10, 12. Dr. Srawley's desperate note on St. Aug. *de Trin.* iii. 4 (*Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 150) is sufficiently refuted by the *de Trinitate* itself (ii. 34, iii. 21, iv. 29, vii. 6), and by *de div. quaest. ad Simpl.* ii. 5.

accepted or satisfactorily accounted for ; (*c*) as to the Gallican rites of Gaul and Spain, as the Dean reminds us, their variable masses contain a number of instances of invocations, some " definite," more of them " indefinite," and his statistics leave open the possibility that we have here a rite in an advanced stage of transition from the one conception of consecration to the other; while, so far as I know, it is the merest guess that these invocations are evidence of Eastern influence. If there ever was anyone who knew anything about this rite, I suppose it was St. Isidore of Seville, and he, in his commentary on it, makes no express mention of the *Qui pridie* at all, but treats what has long been known as the three paragraphs *Postsanctus*, *Qui pridie*, and *Postpridie* as a single prayer, the *conformatio sacramenti* or consecration, and three times over attributes the *conformatio* to the operation of the Holy Ghost*; so that, however the *Postpridie* might be expressed in any given mass, for him the whole prayer was implicitly or explicitly an " invocation of the Holy Ghost." (*d*) It must require some courage to be dogmatic on so obscure a subject as the development of the Roman Canon, so as to be able to say without hesitation that the invocation " never had a place in the Roman Canon." But here again the evidence to the contrary exists, and it must either be accepted, whatever difficulties it involves, as it is by some people—whose opinion, however, the Dean apparently regards as " quite unreasonable "—or else it must be disposed of by some means; he does not suggest how.

5. May I say a word of the invocation of 1549 ? It is fairly obvious that the object of the compilers of that Mass was to combine the invocation, which had become familiar to them in the texts and versions of the ancient Eastern rites which were frequently printed in the sixteenth century (and part of the wording of their invocation, like the opening of the *We do not presume*, is derived from the Liturgy of St. Basil), with the Western tradition everywhere current around them, not only among Catholics, but also, in their own sense, among Lutherans and Reformed; and the simplest way to do this, without creating offence for the Western mind, was to conjoin the " word " of Institution with the " Holy Spirit," and to insert the whole petition into the paragraph corresponding to the *Quam oblationem* of the Roman Canon, before the concluding clause of which it fitted in excellently. But the Dean of Wells tells us that " the wording as well as the position " of it " has proved a constant stumbling-block " to those branches of the Anglican Communion which have adopted more or less the general form of the Canon of 1549. This refers, I suppose, to the fact that the Scots of the eighteenth century removed the invocation from the position before the recital of the Institution which it held in 1549 and in the Scottish Book of 1637, and placed it after the Institution; for the Americans of 1790 only accepted the Scottish order without, so far as I know, considering the Book of 1549. The " stumbling-block " in respect of the position of the invocation was, I conceive, only that it did not follow the precedent of the Eastern Liturgies. But such a position for an invocation was not, in fact, without venerable precedent; for the Liturgy of St. Mark has an " indefinite " invocation of the Holy Ghost in this position; and the Bodleian papyrus fragment, published a few years ago, has a quite " definite " invocation in the same place. As to the wording, which I suppose refers to " thy Holy Spirit *and word*," this " constant stumbling-block " was at least put up with till a few years ago,

* *De Off.* i. 16 §§ 3, 5; 18 § 4; also *Etymol.* vi. 19 (quoting St. Aug. *de Trin.* iii. 4).

when "and word" was removed by the Scots, while the Americans retain it and do not propose to remove it. It is true that this form has no ancient liturgical precedent, whatever the importance of that may be; but it has the sanction, as we have seen, explicitly of such a divine as Paschasius—"verbo Creatoris et virtute Spiritus sancti," "virtute Spiritus sancti per verbum Christi"—and implicitly of all those who recognize that the "word" of Institution is operative through the Eternal Spirit.

6. I can scarcely suppose that the concluding remarks of the Dean of Wells will be found very impressive. It is curious that he should appeal to the "inspiring thought" of our "mediating position" between East and West in support of his contention that we should remain obstinately Western on the question under discussion. It would seem more reasonable that he should recognize that the adoption of an "indefinite" invocation might just produce the balance required for a "mediating position." On the other hand, with regard to our relations with Western divines, while the writers of the "Grey Book" pamphlets seem careless of producing trouble here, the Dean seems to forget that these divines include in their communion lots of Uniat communities which use their own Eastern rites, with their "definite" invocations of the Holy Ghost; and I learn that in the new edition of the Liturgies of the Syrian Uniat, the patriarch, Mgr. Rahmani, has eliminated the latinizing disorders, especially in the canon and the *epiklesis*, which had got into them. As to the introduction of "a new complication to English minds," my impression is that the advocates of the "Grey Book" canon regard their proposal as a simplification; and so far, for myself, I agree with them. The Eastern Liturgies are in my opinion easier to understand than the Western.

7. In conclusion, may I express a desire that the Dean of Wells would use his great influence to secure for us two things.

(*a*) An adequate *eucharistia* for all "liturgical days." It is deplorable that for 300 years and more we have been deprived of anything but the framework of a thanksgiving—the very original element of the Liturgy—on all but thirty-two days in the year. It is true that the proposed revision provides a number of new prefaces; but it still remains that under the most favourable circumstances of the coincidence of festivals, some forty out of fifty-two Sundays in the year have no adequate thanksgiving. Will not the Dean of Wells endeavour to procure for us proper prefaces for Advent, Lent, Passiontide, and one for all unoccupied Sundays?

(*b*) Will he not also endeavour to secure the insertion of "to thee, O Father Almighty," after the first "given thanks" in the Prayer of Consecration, and "to thee" after the second, so as to make it clear to all men that the recital of the Institution is addressed to God and not to the congregation or—must I say it?—to the oblation; the more so that some ecclesiastics, by changing the note of their voice at "Who in the same night," suggest inevitably that it is otherwise addressed?

I am, Sir, yours, etc.,

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD,
June 5, 1924.

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the inquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

St. John xiv. 1-4: *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. 2. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν· ὅτι πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν. 3. καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω ὑμῖν τόπον, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν· ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. 4. καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν.*

The second verse is a well-known *crux* of commentators. At least four translations are possible.

(*a*) R.V.: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you." "Christ reminds His disciples that as He has told them tidings of sorrow so He would not have withheld anything from them" (Westcott).

(*b*) "In my Father's house are many mansions (if it were not so, I would have told you) for I go . . ." The "for" clause explains why the mansions are many.

(*c*) ". . . Otherwise (if there had not been sufficient places all ready), I should have told you that I am going to prepare a place for you."

(*d*) ". . . Otherwise would I have told you that I go . . . ?"

Of these (*a*) is very unconvincing. The resulting sense is: If there had been no place for you, I would not have withheld the bad news, because I am going to prepare a place. It is hard to get any intelligible meaning out of the last sentence. The idea of (*b*) is: There is room for all (as you quite rightly assume—had there not been, I would have told you) for I am going to prepare a place. But if there are places for all, ask the commentators, why prepare them? Against (*a*) and (*b*) is the overwhelming probability that *ὅτι* after *εἶπον* is recitative, corresponding to our inverted commas. Origen assumes this as self-evident. Commenting on xiv. 3, he says: "This seems to contradict what has just been said. Above (v. 2) he speaks as if there was no need to prepare" (*Comm. in Joh.* fr. 105).

Westcott objected to (*c*) that the contradiction between vv. 2 and 3 makes it impossible. Wellhausen struck out v. 3 as eschatological and out of place in this connexion. Loisy strikes out vv. 3-5 as redactional, due to a desire to bring in the Parousia.

when "and word" was removed by the Scots, while the Americans retain it and do not propose to remove it. It is true that this form has no ancient liturgical precedent, whatever the importance of that may be; but it has the sanction, as we have seen, explicitly of such a divine as Paschasius—"verbo Creatoris et virtute Spiritus sancti," "virtute Spiritus sancti per verbum Christi"—and implicitly of all those who recognize that the "word" of Institution is operative through the Eternal Spirit.

6. I can scarcely suppose that the concluding remarks of the Dean of Wells will be found very impressive. It is curious that he should appeal to the "inspiring thought" of our "mediating position" between East and West in support of his contention that we should remain obstinately Western on the question under discussion. It would seem more reasonable that he should recognize that the adoption of an "indefinite" invocation might just produce the balance required for a "mediating position." On the other hand, with regard to our relations with Western divines, while the writers of the "Grey Book" pamphlets seem careless of producing trouble here, the Dean seems to forget that these divines include in their communion lots of Uniat communities which use their own Eastern rites, with their "definite" invocations of the Holy Ghost; and I learn that in the new edition of the Liturgies of the Syrian Uniat, the patriarch, Mgr. Rahmani, has eliminated the latinizing disorders, especially in the canon and the *epiklesis*, which had got into them. As to the introduction of "a new complication to English minds," my impression is that the advocates of the "Grey Book" canon regard their proposal as a simplification; and so far, for myself, I agree with them. The Eastern Liturgies are in my opinion easier to understand than the Western.

7. In conclusion, may I express a desire that the Dean of Wells would use his great influence to secure for us two things.

(*a*) An adequate *eucharistia* for all "liturgical days." It is deplorable that for 300 years and more we have been deprived of anything but the framework of a thanksgiving—the very original element of the Liturgy—on all but thirty-two days in the year. It is true that the proposed revision provides a number of new prefaces; but it still remains that under the most favourable circumstances of the coincidence of festivals, some forty out of fifty-two Sundays in the year have no adequate thanksgiving. Will not the Dean of Wells endeavour to procure for us proper prefaces for Advent, Lent, Passiontide, and one for all unoccupied Sundays?

(*b*) Will he not also endeavour to secure the insertion of "to thee, O Father Almighty," after the first "given thanks" in the Prayer of Consecration, and "to thee" after the second, so as to make it clear to all men that the recital of the Institution is addressed to God and not to the congregation or—must I say it?—to the oblation; the more so that some ecclesiastics, by changing the note of their voice at "Who in the same night," suggest inevitably that it is otherwise addressed?

I am, Sir, yours, etc.,

F. E. BRIGHTMAN.

MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD,
June 5, 1924.

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the inquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

St. John xiv. 1-4: *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. 2. ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν· εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν· ὅτι πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν. 3. καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω ὑμῖν τόπον, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν· ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. 4. καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν.*

The second verse is a well-known *crux* of commentators. At least four translations are possible.

(*a*) R.V.: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you." "Christ reminds His disciples that as He has told them tidings of sorrow so He would not have withheld anything from them" (Westcott).

(*b*) "In my Father's house are many mansions (if it were not so, I would have told you) for I go . . ." The "for" clause explains why the mansions are many.

(*c*) ". . . Otherwise (if there had not been sufficient places all ready), I should have told you that I am going to prepare a place for you."

(*d*) ". . . Otherwise would I have told you that I go . . .?"

Of these (*a*) is very unconvincing. The resulting sense is: If there had been no place for you, I would not have withheld the bad news, because I am going to prepare a place. It is hard to get any intelligible meaning out of the last sentence. The idea of (*b*) is: There is room for all (as you quite rightly assume—had there not been, I would have told you) for I am going to prepare a place. But if there are places for all, ask the commentators, why prepare them? Against (*a*) and (*b*) is the overwhelming probability that *ὅτι* after *εἶπον* is recitative, corresponding to our inverted commas. Origen assumes this as self-evident. Commenting on xiv. 3, he says: "This seems to contradict what has just been said. Above (v. 2) he speaks as if there was no need to prepare" (*Comm. in Joh.* fr. 105).

Westcott objected to (*c*) that the contradiction between vv. 2 and 3 makes it impossible. Wellhausen struck out v. 3 as eschatological and out of place in this connexion. Loisy strikes out vv. 3-5 as redactional, due to a desire to bring in the Parousia.

REVIEWS

A History of the Church of England in India since the Early Days of the East India Company. By Eyre Chatterton, D.D., Bishop of Nagpur. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

A Foreword by the Bishop of Calcutta informs us that this book owes its origin to a decision of the Bishops of the Church of England in India to ask one of their number to narrate the history of the work of the great body to which they belong. The decision was timely, for the old order is about to change and give place to the new. Readers of this graphic narrative will learn much of the difficulties which famous missionaries and Bishops have encountered, and something of those difficulties which their successors encounter to-day. But while looking back into the past and gathering strength and courage from its achievements, they will be well advised to study also the circumstances which have produced present political conditions in India. Various forces are working in the great sub-continent; and only resolute and skilful navigation can bring the ship of the state into calmer waters.

Bishop Chatterton takes us back to the early history of the English in India. Passages in his story of the period from 1607 to 1813 show us that from the first some of our countrymen, far from their homes, could ill-dispense with the ministrations of their Church. We find Sir Thomas Roe, the wise and prescient ambassador of James I. at the Court of the Moghal Emperor Jehangir, losing his chaplain by illness, and promptly applying to the East India Company for another in moving terms: "Here I cannot live the life of an atheist. Let me desire you to endeavour me supply, for I cannot abide in this place destitute of God's Word and Holy Sacrament." His prayer was granted; and, indeed, the Directors of the Company were mindful of such needs, for we find a chaplain in their principal factory at Surat holding services twice daily throughout the week and three times on Sundays, as well as visiting subordinate trading-depots. At a later date they appeal to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge for chaplains "of worth and power," and in 1658 they resolve "to endeavour the advance and the spreading of the Gospel in India." At times, however, the conduct of their servants accords ill with such enterprises. We learn that in the reign of Charles II., when evil influences were strong at home, disturbed greatly by conditions in their settlements and "the disorderly and unchristian conversation of some of their factors and servants in the parts of India, tending

to the dishonour of God and the shame and scandal of the English nation," the Directors ordered that "drunkards, profane swearers and fornicators," who proved incorrigible, should be sent to England. They also framed regulations with a view to render "the religion which we profess amiable in the sight of the heathen among whom our servants reside."

The close of the seventeenth century brought many trials and difficulties to the Company and its servants. The Moghal Empire was decaying. It was necessary to take effective means to defend the English settlements from surrounding strife and disorder. Life was further embittered by the competition of a junior and rival association. But in the first years of the eighteenth century the old and the new Companies were amalgamated and started on a joint career with a noble benediction from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London: "Let Thy grace, we most humbly beseech Thee, be with Thy servants, the united Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies, and grant that they may prove a common blessing by the increase of honour, wealth, and power to our native country. Give to us and all Thy servants whom Thy Providence has placed in these remote parts of the World, grace to discharge our several duties, with piety towards Thee our God, loyalty towards our King, fidelity and diligence towards them by whom we are employed, kindness and love towards one another, and sincere charity towards all men; that we, adorning the gospel of our Lord and Saviour in all things, these Indian nations among whom we dwell, beholding our good works, may be won over thereby to love our most real religion and glorify Thee."

The early history of Calcutta tells the same story, the need of religion. Our author narrates the romantic story of the founding of this great city by stout-hearted Job Charnock, whose tombstone outside St. John's Church still records that having returned to his eternal home after long years of wandering over foreign soil, he there awaits the coming of Christ the Judge. Later on, the Directors, disturbed by reports of frequent irreligion and immorality in the settlement, sent strong dispatches on the subject to the Governor and his Council, ordering the former to attend Church and interest himself in the moral life of the community. When the fort and settlement were overwhelmed by the army of Sira-ud-daula in June, 1756, the Chaplain, Gervase Bellamy, after thirty years of strenuous labour, perished in the Black Hole. Holwell's narrative tells us how, when the author found a stupor coming on apace, he laid himself down by that gallant old man, the Rev. Gervase Bellamy, who lay dead with his son, the Lieutenant,

hand in hand, near the southernmost wall of the prison. "Uno avulso non deficit alter"; and when Clive, coming to the rescue of his countrymen in Bengal, conquered at Plassey, he required a worthy successor to Bellamy and summoned to Calcutta the famous John Zachary Kiernander, a Swedish missionary who had for years been working in Southern India on behalf of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Kiernander arrived in 1758, and died blind many years afterwards, in extreme old age, after the severest trials. He was a personal friend of the great Clive, who stood sponsor for his son Robert. An unknown writer records of this wholehearted missionary: "It is no small thing that he, mainly at his own expense, erected a Church where no Church was, and thus restored to the inhabitants of the chief city of British India the long-forfeited privileges of worshipping God in a public place consecrated to His service." The old Mission Church of Calcutta, built by Kiernander, was soon followed by St. John's Church, which owed its foundation partly to the energy of the chaplain, the Rev. W. Johnson, and partly to the generosity and keen personal interest of Warren Hastings.

So much for early Church efforts in Calcutta. Turning to Southern India, Bishop Chatterton describes the earnest labours of the Roman Catholic Church there in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He tells us of Francis Xavier, of Robert de Nobili, who "lived as an Indian to the Indians," donned the yellow robe of a Hindu ascetic, and allowed his converts to retain the forms and ceremonies of their castes. And, passing on to Protestant efforts, our author describes the Danish mission to Tranquebar and the labours of the great Lutheran missionary Christian, Schwartz, who, on one occasion, was sent by the East India Company as ambassador to the Court of Haidar Ali. It is to Schwartz, Bishop Chatterton says, and to other Lutheran missionaries that we owe the large number of Indian Christians which we have in Southern India to-day. Schwartz's epitaph in the Fort Church at Madras records that he "went about doing good, his life being one continued effort to imitate the example of his Blessed Master." In him religion appeared "with a graceful form and placid dignity."

It appears that the Directors of the East India Company, when they became masters of a wide dominion, while still anxious about the morale of their own servants, apprehended danger from attempts to proselytize their Hindu and Muslim subjects. In the last years of the eighteenth century the only missionaries in British India were Evangelical chaplains, the most famous of whom was Henry Martyn. Claudius Buchanan, another Chaplain, first suggested the need of a definitely

organized ecclesiastical establishment for India. And so we come to the year 1813 and the end of the first period of the work of the Church of England in India. It was a memorable year in the history of British India, for then, when renewing the Company's charter, Parliament required the Directors to spend annually £10,000 at least on the revival and improvement of Indian literature and on the introduction of "the sciences" among the people of India. At the same time a Bill was passed establishing a Bishopric at Calcutta, and archdeaconries at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. It is noteworthy that William Wilberforce was the promoter of both these pieces of legislation. Professor Coupland* tells us that to him "the notion of the British Government fulfilling a trust for the welfare of the Indian people seemed almost farcical if it did nothing whatever to raise them from ignorance and idolatry." Thus it was decreed that from the year 1813 the endeavours of our Church in India was to be guided and co-ordinated by a succession of remarkable men.

The first of these was Dr. Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, who found only 32 chaplains, for troops and civilians, of whom 15 belonged to Bengal, 12 to Madras, and 5 to Bombay. Large numbers of civilians never saw a clergyman during the whole of their service. Marriages, burials, and baptisms were frequently administered by laymen; churches were very few. Middleton lost no time in extending Christian effort. But it was his successor, Reginald Heber, poet and saint, who, dying suddenly after a short incumbency of three years, yet lives and speaks to us not only through four of our noblest hymns, but through the strength, the sweetness, and the holiness of his personality. As our author points out, between 1815 and 1831 Calcutta received four Bishops, all of whom died in harness worn out by work and touring. And thus it was that when the Company's charter was again renewed by Parliament in 1833, and the promotion of European literature and science among the natives of India was definitely initiated, the Sovereign was empowered to make the Calcutta Diocese a Metropolitan See and to appoint two Suffragan Bishops, one for Madras and one for Bombay. The first Bishop of Madras was appointed in 1835, and the first Bishop of Bombay in 1837.

Our author gives us a full account of great work done in all directions by Daniel Wilson, the first Metropolitan, who had been a contemporary of Heber's at Oxford. He gave a great impetus to the building of churches; he founded a much-needed Additional Clergy Society; he visited Borneo and consecrated the church there erected by Sir James Brooke, the famous Raja

* Coupland's *Wilberforce*, p. 383.

of Sarawak; he built and consecrated the cathedral at Calcutta. "As a man of affairs and a driving force," says Bishop Chatterton, "he has had no rival amongst those who came before or who have followed him." In Wilson's old age came the Mutiny, and in that dark hour he desponded: "We are all together in a sinking ship," he once observed; and yet he lived to hear of the capture of Delhi and of the relief of Lucknow.

Our author's chapters on the work of the Church in Madras are of remarkable interest, more particularly the passages relating to the origin and history of the domiciled Anglo-Indian community. It would be well if the numbers, the position, and the prospects of these people had attracted more attention in England when detailed arrangements were made for launching India on her present course. They have every reason to regard the future with serious anxiety.

A famous Bishop of Madras was Frederick Gell, a pupil of Arnold of Rugby, who held office from 1861 to 1898, and before he resigned consecrated two missionary Bishops to assist him in the work of the Diocese. He was succeeded by Henry Whitehead, who has lately retired, after twenty-three years of strenuous labour, amid deep and widespread regrets. Eurasians and domiciled Anglo-Indians owe him a particular debt of gratitude.

We have also here a summary of the history of the Bombay Diocese which is at present in the capable hands of Bishop Edwin James Palmer. The presidency of Bombay is, as our author remarks, prominent in India "in matters intellectual and spiritual, in politics whether of reform or revolution, in industrial progress." It was here that modern Extremism was first preached by Poona Brahmans. Our author notices the work of Bombay chaplains in cantonments ranging as far as Aden, and speaks of the Sailors' Institute in the capital city, to which more than £40,000 were locally subscribed as a thank-offering to our sailors at the close of the Great War.

We are told of work in the Dioceses of Colombo, Lahore, Rangoon, Travancore, Chota Nagpur, Lucknow, Tinnevelly and Madura, Nagpur, Assam. In other chapters Bishop Chatterton resumes the history of Calcutta, the mother diocese, and tells us of Cotton and Milman, of Johnson and of Lefroy. It will profit us to linger over the names of the first and the last of these saints of God. Cotton was deeply impressed by the fact that the sight of unchristian, uncared-for Englishmen springing up in the midst of a heathen population must be fatal to the spread of Christianity in India. He was astonished at the number of British-born or British-descended persons in Calcutta. This was sixty years ago. There are many more

now. "I imagined," wrote Cotton, "Calcutta to be a large city, occupied by European officials and merchants; with the soldiers in the Fort and sailors by the riverside. . . . I need not say that such anticipations have been entirely falsified by the reality; there can be no city where, from the strange mingling of inhabitants, of English and East Indians, descendants of the old Portuguese settlers or of the slaves whom they imported, of traders from all parts of the world, the Church's work is more imperative or more difficult." Among the Fathers of the Church in India not one is more interesting than Cotton. We can well understand how even those who did not share his faith appreciated "his great knowledge, his sincerity, and his charity." His character is written on his face, of which Bishop Chatterton has given us an excellent presentment.

The memory of the noble presence of George Alfred Lefroy is yet green in India. Bishop Chatterton says truly: "He was one of the greatest missionaries our Church has ever had in India. Had Bishops Cotton and Milman been present when George Lefroy was addressing great crowds in the Chandni Chauk at Delhi, in perfect Urdu and with an extraordinary grip over his audience, they would have hesitated before they discouraged bazaar preaching. As Head of the Cambridge Mission to Delhi, Lefroy exercised an influence amongst all classes of Indians unlike any before or after him. So highly was he respected by the Muhammadans that he was sometimes invited to discuss the truths of our religion within the precincts of their mosques." We cannot understand why this book, which contains such interesting portraits, gives us no picture of Lefroy, although he appears in a group on the frontispiece. Perhaps the reason is that his image is still deeply engraved on the hearts and minds of many.

Our author's conclusions are summarized in his last chapter. He briefly traces the history of the past from the time when the East India Company sent chaplains to care for the moral and spiritual welfare of its much-tried servants to the year 1813, when Parliament decided that it owed a Christian duty to India, and on from the Mutiny to our own day.

When Calcutta received its first Bishop, Christians in India of all races and denominations numbered 700,000. There are now over 4,000,000, of whom between 500,000 and 600,000 belong to the Anglican communion. Then there was one Anglican Bishop in Asia; now there are 13 dioceses in the Province of India, Burma, and Ceylon. Then there were 40 Anglican clergy and no Indian clergy; now there are about 1,000 clergy, of whom one-third are Indians. Of these Indians one is a Bishop and two are archdeacons. Then there were only 15 churches

in the country; and now there are well over 1,200. Then there was no vernacular prayer-book. Now the Prayer-Book of our Church has been translated into fourteen Indian languages. There are also many translations of the scriptures into Indian languages and dialects, 19,000,000 copies of which have been distributed by the Bible Society alone in India, beside the enormous number issued by the S.P.C.K. But the influence of Christianity in India cannot be measured by statistics. The doctrines and the diction of the New Testament have often attracted, and still attract, enthusiastic admiration from many Indians who have never declared themselves Christians. The last Report of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta tells us of the interest which they excite even among the most ardent disciples of the new Nationalism. It is certain that this interest must work for good. Damaging though the Great War was to the repute of Christian civilization, the figure and teaching of the Saviour still appeal and will always appeal to the minds and hearts of men who find no such figure or teaching in their own creeds. And to numbers of our own countrymen the faith of their fathers and their childhood has a value far greater than would be judged by a superficial observer, a sustaining strength which nothing else can ever supply. The greatest work of the Church of England in India lies below the surface.

In his last two pages our author refers to the movement to sever the legal connection between that Church and its parent body in this country. It has been decided by the leaders of the former that with the passing of the Church Powers Bill through Parliament and the formation of a National Assembly of the Church of England, the time has come for taking the necessary steps to secure legal independence for the Church in India. An Indian Church Measure has therefore been drafted in England and approved by the Provincial Council at Calcutta. It is under discussion in India. It proposes to enable the Church in India to choose her own Bishops, settle the boundaries of her own dioceses, hold her own synods, also to bind her members by a voluntary contract to obey the laws made by their Church. The Church in India will also deal through her own courts with members who fail in their obligations and will adopt her own expressions of faith, worship, rites, and ceremonies.

Bishop Chatterton says that some persons regard these proposals with grave apprehensions, fearing that the new order "will cripple the Church, especially on its English and Anglo-Indian side, very seriously from a financial point of view. They think, too, that the Indian section of the Church is not as yet sufficiently developed to have such large powers entrusted to it." Our author is, however, disposed to persevere in the

contemplated separation which has the approval of the Metropolitan and of leading authorities in the Church in India. Yet it seems to us that the wisdom of the change is certainly open to doubt. Bishop Chatterton writes: "If for a short period of transition difficulties have to be faced, what will these seem later on, when compared with the great achievement, whereby the Church of the factory has become the Church of the people of India?" Surely these words simply beg the present question. Does Bishop Chatterton think that the fears which are entertained are well founded? If so, do reasons exist which compel the Church of England to disregard them? What are these reasons, and have they binding force? These are the issues. They are grave indeed and cannot be disposed of by optimistic forecasts.

In conclusion, we trust that this book will be widely read. It abounds in historical information of real value to which no review can do justice. Here and there we have detected mistakes as, for instance, the name of Sir Auckland Colvin on page 256. The Lieutenant-Governor at Agra, in 1857, was Mr. John Colvin, Sir Auckland's father. But such mistakes in no way detract from the merits of a volume of singular interest both to the general reader and to those who will have to decide on issues of the first importance. Perhaps the supreme value of the book is that by bringing us closer to men of great faith and power, by enabling us to see them walk the earth and to hear them speak, it leads the reader to aspire to possess at least a small portion of their spirit.

H. V. Lovett.

Ideas of God in Israel: their Content and Development. By Edward Pace. Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d.

A book which will take into its purview not only the beliefs and customs of the Arabs of the *Jāhiliyya*, but also the cultus of Mesopotamia and Egypt in the formative period of Israel's religious history is much to be desired. A historical prolegomenon to such a book already exists in Burney's *Judges*. The majority of works on Hebrew religion abound in references to pre-Muhammadan Arabian animism, and to the worship of the Baals by the Canaanites: but though Palestine lies across the track of the world's most ancient caravan routes, though intercourse with Egypt is attested both by archæology and tradition, and Israel's ancestor and God are located first in Mesopotamia, those who desire to study the origin of the world's greatest religion must be content with a survey of only one side of it.

Dr. Pace does not, it is true, attempt to give us a "comprehensive account of religion in Israel, but rather to isolate for study that element in religion which is of primary importance—namely, belief in a God whose nature and character are known to his worshippers"; but, nevertheless, his object is to "describe the content of the ideas of God as they existed in our Lord's day, and then to trace them backward, observing, where possible, their evolution from the early forms"; and we might justifiably expect some discussion of the influence of Egypt and Mesopotamia on the ethics of the early Hebrews.

When the Muslim to-day bows his head to The Compassionate, he is closely adhering to the thought and word of his far-off kinsman in Ur and Harran who prayed to Sin (who was also Yahu) as the Compassionate Father. No cogent reason can be given for the invention of the Hebrew tradition that Abraham, their forefather, migrated from sanctuaries where, as we know now, Yahweh was worshipped, and consequently—so far, at any rate, as a part of Israel is concerned—there is good reason for accepting the Old Testament view that Abraham, not Moses, was the father of the Hebrew religion. Dr. Pace's view that "Yahweh, when accepted by Israel, was the God of a nomad tribe of the desert, and his nature and character must be sought in the religious conceptions of the Kenites, not in those of later Israel," though popular with some scholars, does not, we believe, do justice to all the facts. It ignores the composite character of the twelve tribes. No one now would maintain that all the tribes came under the influence of Moses: everyone admits that the evidence for the existence of Hebrew tribes in Canaan before, during, and after the Exodus is uncommonly good. Were they Yahweh-worshippers? Is it not possible that Yahweh, even in those early days, was worshipped as a moral and an ethical God? These are questions more easily asked than answered; but are we justified in arbitrarily fixing both a date and a character to that God whom tradition asserts had revealed Himself to the patriarchs, a tradition which archæology undoubtedly strengthens?

Our author's plan is to sketch the ideas of God held in our Lord's time, and to work back to the beginning of Israel's history. It is difficult, in spite of the advantages claimed for this method, to see what is gained by looking through the wrong end of the telescope. Dr. Pace tells us that "our knowledge of the religious life and thought of Israel in the time of our Lord is derived mainly from the Gospels," and in possession of this belief he is able to avoid any reference to the Talmud, and to reconstruct the religion of the Jewish peasant of the first century from the superstitions of the modern Syrian

fallāh! There are points of resemblance between present-day beliefs and those held by Jews in the time of Christ; but in order to establish filiation between A and B, it is not sufficient to adduce evidence of their resemblance to one another, without showing that the actual relation of A to B is such as to render the hypothetical filiation possible, and also that the hypothesis fits in with all the relevant facts.

A belief in the active intervention of Elijah in men's affairs is one such resemblance. The New Testament, the Talmud, and the Ḥadīth literature all speak of Elijah's help and encouragement given to the faithful, especially after prayer, but it is difficult, though not impossible, to believe that the words quoted from Curtiss (on p. 24) containing the assertion of the guardian of Elijah's cave on Carmel that "Khuddr (the name should, of course, be written Al Khadir or Khiḍr) is my god and my father's god; he has supported us for years," are an expression of theological belief. We suspect the speaker was a cynical modernist of the type Burton loved to depict.

The theological student for whom, as the cover tells us, the book is intended, will rub his eyes when he reads (p. 34) that Jesus taught that the "Father is so near to His children that no intermediary is needed to establish communion between Him and them."

The chapters on Animism in its varied forms are well and clearly written, the point of view and scope closely resembling Kautzsch's article in H.D.B. The messages of the prophets are well summarized in the second part of the book. The vexed question of the attitude of the earlier prophets towards sacrifice is dealt with fearlessly by the author, who believes that the cultus was unknown during the Exodus. Yet Jer. vii. 22 is not necessarily to be translated as the R.V. renders it. Moreover, the difficulty is not removed by invoking Graf and Wellhausen as to P, and discounting D; for J and E still have to be reckoned with.

The concluding part of the book is occupied with a good and clear explanation of the supersession of the prophet by the scribe. The writer brings out in an interesting way the retrograde character of this movement in religious thought, and shows how the later Jews shifted the emphasis from the ethical to the legal. To those who are not familiar with the Bible Dictionaries in English, the book should serve as a useful introduction to Old Testament theology.

ALFRED GUILLAUME.

NOTICES

British Contemporary Philosophy. First Series. Edited by J. H. Muirhead, LL.D. Emeritus Professor of the University of Birmingham. London : George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 16s. net. Library of Philosophy.

George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., have placed English thinkers under a debt of gratitude for their continuation of the Library of Philosophy under the able editorship of Dr. Muirhead. The series has included in the past the famous volume by Bradley on "Appearance and Reality"; Translations of Bergson's works; Hegel's "Phenomenology of Mind"; C. C. J. Webb's Gifford Lectures; Brett's "History of Psychology"; Erdmann's "History of Philosophy"; and works by Bosanquet, Varisco, Bertrand Russell and other outstanding philosophers.

Dr. Muirhead has now enriched the series by a solid volume, the first of two, which are to deal with contemporary British Philosophy. The plan is an excellent one. In the volume before us we have personal statements designed to give us a picture of present-day philosophy of which the parts are sketched in by those who have been the chief contributors to its development. No less than sixteen men of proven worth add their contribution to the present volume and another volume is to follow this, planned on the same lines.

Lord Haldane rightly reminds us of the value of concise statement of broad principles because of the tendency of the times in philosophy. Discussion to-day is apt, he says, to lose precision by concentration on details. Hence one clear merit of the present work is that it enables the average reader, who is unversed in the technicalities of philosophical debates, to gain a comprehensive and synoptic view of the general trend of contemporary British philosophy and to study the philosophical position of many well-known thinkers in summary form and in their own words. If the result of such a study induces the student to go on to a deeper investigation of the contribution of any one individual philosopher, by a more detailed examination of his published works, all the better. The present volume enables us to see in broad outline what the position and the contribution of each writer is. By some we are attracted; by others repelled. With some we may feel at once a sense of kinship and a desire to acquaint ourselves more fully with their philosophical outlook. An examination of the written statements of others may convince us that in our own search after truth and our own desire to penetrate into the nature of Reality, these particular men have no message for us, though they may appeal with power to others. We do not know any better work to commend to seekers after truth and to those who feel drawn to study philosophical problems and who at the same time are hesitating as to what best to read by way of introduction. The study of philosophy to-day repels many because their first introduction to it takes the form of an attempt to read an elaborate treatise, the meaning of which they partially or wholly fail to grasp. Hence they conclude, somewhat hastily, that the whole subject is beyond them and outside their range. Here is a book with which to commence. Here also will be found so many rich suggestions in the way of constructive thought, that we shall be surprised if the reading of it fails to enable the student

to find in one or more directions just the line along which he may make rapid progress in his aim to come to terms with philosophical speculation and to find his place for good or evil in the search after reality. We commend the book to beginners. We have no hesitation in commending it also to those already well acquainted with the larger works of present-day philosophers. Its value to them lies in the opportunity it affords to study and compare the matured thoughts of so many writers compressed into so small a compass. The question, perhaps, which will occur to readers of THEOLOGY in reading the title will be whether there are signs of any tendency in contemporary British philosophy towards a Theistic position. They will expect to find such a position maintained by, *e.g.*, the Dean of St. Paul's. What, however, of those whose hitherto published works have served but to reveal the cleavage between philosophy and religion? We must leave our readers to answer the question for themselves by studying the volume. It certainly opens the way for an interesting article, if not for another volume, upon the subject of the religious implications in some contemporary British philosophical efforts to tread the pathway to Reality.

H. MAURICE RELTON.

THE WORLD OF SOULS. By Wincenty Lutoslawski, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Wilno, in Poland. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd. 10s. 6d. net.

We gather that this book is a short formulation of the Polish national conception of Being. Souls alone are Being and Lutoslawski himself, in one of the many autobiographical touches which abound in his work, gives us the record of a peculiar personal experience by which he reached immediate intuitive certainty as to the reality, permanence, indestructibility and immortality of his own Soul (pp. 198-199). There are chapters on the "Soul's Existence," the "World of Souls," "Individual Training," and "Immortality." A chapter on "Bi-Sexual Association," dealing with the author's theory of sex and true love, is followed by another under the title of "A New Theory of Sex," written many years later.

What are we to make of it all? No attempted reproduction in outline of the ideas in the book could do justice to the author and would probably mislead the readers of this review. The author writes in order to discover souls akin to himself who, thus reached by means of the written word, are invited by him to communicate, first by correspondence, and then, if possible, by personal contact. He dreams of a possible gathering of an elect company, "to give him in order to build somewhere in the mountains, in a sunny climate, a peaceful retreat fit for those who would submit themselves to a thorough training of soul and body in order to attain true wisdom by deepening first their knowledge of themselves and then of every other kind of real existence in order to emancipate themselves from the rule of illusions and to enjoy a fullness of life which is possible only when one is true to one's own self" (p. 224).

Upon the desirability of such a "Forge for Stealing Souls" most of us will agree, but whether to join with Lutoslawski in its formation and to have him in the company of the elect ones is a question our readers must decide for themselves after reading his book.

H. MAURICE RELTON.

THE THREE RELIGIONS OF CHINA. By the Rev. W. E. Soothill. Second edition. Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

It is encouraging to students of religion, as it is no doubt gratifying to the Oxford Professor of Chinese, to find that a second edition of this book has been called for; for this is probably to be regarded as an indication not only of the needs of missionaries, but also of the steady growth of interest in non-Christian religions, and of their comparative study among men who are concerned to investigate the foundations of religion and so to test the truth of its various forms. There is grave danger in that superficial acquaintance with Oriental faiths which is the stock-in-trade of Western dilettanti professing an eclectic religion with an air of conscious superiority, a danger which must be met by the serious study of the beliefs and practices of Eastern peoples, as these are expounded by teachers with expert knowledge. And the study of the religions of China has a special importance for us, because it involves not only the consideration of Mahayanistic Buddhism, to which Theosophy is so largely indebted, but also an examination of the Confucian system of ethics, which is not without its likeness to the agnostic moral code of many English people of the better educated classes.

Professor Soothill's book is made up of lectures addressed originally to missionary students, clearly arranged and very clearly expressed, and bearing throughout the marks of sound scholarship and ripe experience. After separate surveys of the origin and growth of the religions of the Chinese people, Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism, the three are treated together under subject-headings covering the whole range of their practice. This is, of course, more than justified; it is required by the fact that the Chinese normally profess all three religions in varying proportions, by virtue of the common fundamental principle of the Tao. The method of treatment adopted is to present fairly the higher elements of Chinese religion as these are revealed in the religious literature and in the lives of some of the people, together with the lower elements which are only too evident in the practice of the masses. The point of view of the Christian missionary is maintained throughout, but it is the point of view of the missionary who is eager to recognize and to use the good that he finds.

In this edition the chapter on Buddhism has been considerably revised, and other minor alterations have been made. As it now stands, this book offers the most reliable introduction to the study of Chinese religions that is available.

O. HARDMAN.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT ELEMENTS IN CHRISTIANITY. By O. C. Quick. Longmans. 6s.

It is easy to criticize Canon Quick's labels, and to point out how the Catholicism and Protestantism of historic Christianity overlap. In view of his main thesis that they are complementary, and of his careful and repeated statements that he is considering the real antitheses of Christianity under names which only loosely and broadly represent them, such quibbling is unnecessary and ungracious. "We are Prots; I suppose you are Rits," was the somewhat queer epigram with which at a first call the wife of a London Vicar of Evangelical leanings introduced herself to a newcomer in the Deanery; yet there was much ritual of a kind in her

husband's church, and much Protestantism in the mind of the newcomer. Yes, of course, Canon Quick's "Protestant" elements were not born with Luther, nor is the most formless type of Christianity quite devoid of his "Catholic" elements, or where would be the good of an effort to bring the two types together? It is the very fact that in practice the typical elements tend to work together that provides the hope that they may prove to be complementary values in the long run.

The method of this effort in the direction of understanding the varying expressions on the face of modern Christianity is scientific in its balanced detachment, carefulness of statement, and exploration of the fundamental; but only so far as scientific method can be applied to such phenomena as religion represents; that goes without saying. But it does its work if it provides even a provisional analysis of the confused mass of surging matter full of apparent oppositions and likenesses which Christianity, as a whole, appears to be. And it certainly provides such a provisional analysis, both in the spheres of thought and practice. There is the antithesis of salvation by belief and salvation in a society, the antithesis of origin and development, of individual and corporate body, of declaration of fact and effective action in the sacramental sphere running back in reality to opposing ideas of the Atonement and the Incarnation. There is the antithesis of knowledge and conduct, which is really the opposition of Platonism and historical development, and the source of the grand opposition between ecclesiastical legalism moulding semi-conscious religious life and the liberty or anarchy of the Spirit. There is the set of antitheses introduced into religious thought and practice by modern psychology in its teaching about instinct, desire, and behaviour. And, finally, there is the antithesis of worldly and other-worldly in the opposing ideas of the Kingdom of Heaven. It is through these varying spheres that Canon Quick goes with his measuring rod, detecting the fundamental, ignoring the accidental, assigning marks of merit or failure, and ever seeking the promise of a final synthesis. His task needed wide and deep historical knowledge, a judicial spirit unstirred by party feeling, more than a bowing-acquaintance with psychology, and a metaphysics which should give a firm foothold and a real background to the inquiry. His book is remarkable for its combination of all these endowments, and it is where he trenches on psychology that his scalpel is especially effective; he has stated in a very attractive form in his treatment of the psychological dogma that the test of real desire is satisfaction, his own view that this carries with it the assurance that communion with God is the only ultimate satisfaction.

Running through all the antitheses of religion, in which Catholic and Protestant more or less take sides, is the great antithesis of the Eternal and the Temporal, which Canon Quick in his short Epilogue, allowing for the essential values of both the eternal and the historical aspects of God, claims has its synthesis in the Cross: "Perhaps we should start from the idea that, to our human vision at least, the true glory of heaven consists in the completed self-sacrifice which has conquered evil by passing through death to resurrection. The completed self-sacrifice issues in fulness of eternal life, but that life is ever characterized by a real act of sacrifice which by its inherent nature must take place under conditions of temporal limitation."

W. J. FERRAR.

BOOK NOTES

Living Issues in Religious Thought. From George Fox to Bertrand Russell. By H. G. Wood. Allen and Unwin. 6s. Ten thoughtful and interesting papers originally contributed to the *Expositor* and other journals by the Professor of New Testament Literature and Church History at the Selby Oak Colleges are collected in this volume. The sub-title, which was apparently intended at first for the title in order to suggest the range of subjects dealt with, unfortunately appears at the head of the page throughout the book; but the title which has superseded it is a far better indication of the contents. These reveal a mind keenly and critically attentive to contemporary thought in its bearing on the Church's Gospel, and they give evidence of desire and ability to assist in the promotion of the spiritual revival which is expected by the writer. It is his belief that "the revival will bring men back to the Bible and to the Church, but it will shatter the legends of verbal inspiration and infallible authority." *Seeing Life Whole.* A Christian Philosophy of Life. By Henry Churchill King. Macmillan. 7s. In the brief compass of 160 pages the President of Oberlin College states his view of the Christian philosophy of life in its relation to the whole range of modern thought, finding room, nevertheless, for a wealth of quotation drawn from many sources, and making liberal use of italicized statements. After five preliminary approaches in the attempt to see life whole—the Scientific, the Psychological, the Value (so-called), the Personal and Ethical, and the Philosophical—there follows in conclusion the Biblical and Christian Approach, which treats of the individual Christian and his use of the Bible, and completely ignores the existence of the Church. *Christianity and Social Science.* A Challenge to the Church. By Charles A. Ellwood, Ph.D. Macmillan. 8s. There is a growing tendency in the Church to-day to recognize and to accept responsibility in the matter of social reform, and to pay to social science the respectful attention which is its due. Outside organized Christianity, on the other hand, there are welcome signs of a complementary appreciation of the fact that all work for social amelioration needs the inspiration and sustaining power of religion, the best that may be had. Dr. Ellwood, with a clear grasp of the situation, has written a book which should do much to promote this better understanding. It deserves to be carefully considered by all who suppose that church work and social work are forever separated by a wide gulf, while those who are already convinced, wholly or partly, of the error of this position will do well to follow the writer to his conclusion as to the need of consecrated service in the spirit of the early saints and martyrs. "There is just one way in which the transition can be effected from our semi-pagan civilization to a true Christian civilization, and that is for members of the Christian Church, one here and one there at first and then the many following, to consecrate themselves, without any limit or reservation whatsoever, to the forwarding of the Christian cause." *Christian Ways of Salvation.* By George W. Richards, D.D., LL.D. Macmillan. 12s. Much honest work has gone to the making of these lectures, which were delivered before the Auburn Theological Seminary by the Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, Lancaster, Pa. With an eye to the reconciliation of the Churches, and with a strong

conviction that the essential element in all of them is the experience of salvation, he has sought to expound the various "ways of salvation" which have emerged in the course of the Church's history as he reads it—viz., the Way of Jesus, the Ways of the Apostles, the Ancient Catholic Way, the Orthodox Catholic Way, the Roman Catholic Way, the Evangelical Ways, and the Way of the Humanists, this central section of the book being prefaced by a brief account of some non-Christian ways of redemption. The author's conclusion is that, while "men doubtless have been saved and are being saved in the Greek Catholic, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Calvinist, and the Baptist Church," the Christian task is done "most effectively by evangelical Churches." Those who are unable to agree with the conclusion may none the less recognize the value of the method of approach, and may be glad to use with discrimination the material contained in the series of expositions of the "ways." O. H.

The Law of Moses. By Edouard Naville, with Preface by Henry Wace, D.D. Thynne. M. Naville's thesis is that the Pentateuch is the work of Moses. The Mosaic legislation is an oral legislation. Moses wrote down his teaching by degrees as he gave it, interspersing records of events as they happened. Differences of style and vocabulary are due to differences of setting; Moses himself "could not be absolutely the same on leaving Egypt as after forty years spent in the wilderness," and at the end of his career he was addressing another generation. The critics come in for some hard knocks, but the book is temperate in language, and the argument skilfully reasoned. *The Christian Child* (after Mgr. de Ségur). By G. H. Doble. Cath. Lit. Assoc. This book is an adaptation of the work of a French priest, addressed to children between the ages of nine and fifteen. The first part is divided into two books, dealing respectively with "Piety and the Christian Virtues" and "Temptation and Sin." The second part contains three books, "Prayer," "Confession," and "Holy Communion," the whole concluding with Morning and Evening Prayers. The book is well illustrated, and it is written in a style likely to appeal to children. But the great stress laid on frequent confessions and weekly communions makes us doubt whether Mr. Doble is a sound guide in child psychology. *What is the English Use?* By Colin Dunlop (Alcuin Club Publication). A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. A small book of thirty-four pages, this "Inquiry into the Principles underlying the Conduct of Public Worship in the Church of England" deserves to be carefully studied. The English Use is a principle; taking the Prayer Book seriously, it claims to interpret its spirit. The principle involved is liturgical obedience. The Church of England, as a Catholic authority, has power to decree rites and ceremonies. The old English customs, not modern Roman developments, are the best medium for expressing the Prayer Book services, which "being put forward by a Catholic authority are liturgically adequate, . . . though enrichment and scientific development is very desirable." The adoption of the practical suggestions at the end of the book would go far towards introducing order into the present chaos. *The Universal Church.* A Study in the Lambeth Call to Union. By T. A. Lacey. Mowbray. Are heretics and schismatics, if duly baptized and believing in Jesus Christ, in any sense members of the Church? Canon Lacey supports the Lambeth bishops' contention that they are. He shows that there has

always been a distinction between the "Universal Church" and the "Catholic Church," the Church "extensive" (the flock), and the Church "intensive" (the fold). The language and practice of the patristic Church points to the belief that "some heretics are in the flock . . . no heretic is in the fold." In later times, "Heretics were treated as within the ambit of spiritual jurisdiction, and therefore as members of the Church." The recent statements and actions of the Orthodox Churches of the East support this view. The Great Schism of the West in 1378 was healed by "proceedings which were obviously irregular, done in defiance of the dominant theory which excluded schismatics from the Church."

E. L. H.

The Blessed Sacrament: Faith and Works. By H. P. Denison, B.A. Robert Scott. 2s. 6d. This book deals with the Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, and is an appeal for Exposition and Benediction. Prebendary Denison's main appeal in theology seems to be to the prejudice of the ignorant; his attitude to the whole Anglican Episcopate may be considered "correct" in certain circles, but we think it impossible to reconcile with any kind of loyalty to the Catholic Church; and his air of suave superiority is an irritating caricature of the behaviour which turns away wrath. He makes no attempt to meet the two objections which make many good Catholics suspicious of Benediction. It is extra-liturgical—that means, it is an addition to the purpose for which the Blessed Sacrament was instituted. And there is a grave danger lest a devotion which is rooted, not in sound historical and theological learning, but in mere pragmatism—the "simple" find that it helps—should lead to the kind of belief in a localized God which is materialistic and sub-Christian. *Thy Love and Thy Grace.* By C. Lattey, S.J. B. Herder. This is an eight-days' retreat, intended primarily for religious, but parish priests and pious lay-folk will find much in it to their advantage. Father Lattey uses the *Exercises* of St. Ignatius as the groundwork of his book; he prefixes a poem to each day's meditation, in imitation of the *Anima Christi*, which the Founder put at the head of his book. The frontispiece is a reproduction of a most interesting old Flemish picture, in which the crucifix grows out of a chalice and immediately passes into a vine. *The Living God:* The Revelation of the Holy Trinity in the New Testament. By Jules Lebreton. The Faith Press. 5s. The professor of the history of Christian origins in the Catholic University of Paris has written, by the permission of authority, a book for Anglican readers on the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. He acknowledges the debt which he owes ("support and fresh light") to the writings of Anglican theologians. The treatment of the New Testament evidence is in no way reactionary, but some of the deepest problems are not mentioned. But as the book is not intended as an apologetic work for the convincing of doubters, but as a manual for the instruction of believers, we can recommend it heartily, and express the wish that more of this kind of collaboration were possible.

A. E. B.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER